METHODS AND MATERIALS OF LITERARY CRITICISM

LYRIC, EPIC, AND ALLIED FORMS OF POETRY

THE LIST PRICE
OF THIS [illegible] IS 3 00

Graduate Room
PN
1105
G25

1868

THE LIBRARY
OF
THE UNIVERSITY
OF CALIFORNIA
LOS ANGELES

GIFT OF

FREDERIC THOMAS BLANCHARD

Blanchard

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2007 with funding from
Microsoft Corporation

http://www.archive.org/details/methodsmaterials00gayliala

College
Library
PN
1105
G25

PREFACE

This book is the second of a series entitled Methods and Materials of Literary Criticism, the volumes of which, though contributory to a common aim, are severally independent. The first volume (Gayley and Scott, 1899) was an introduction to the bases in aesthetics and poetics, theoretical and historical. The present volume applies the methods there developed to the comparative study of the lyric, the epic, and some allied forms of poetry. A third volume, approaching completion, will present tragedy, comedy, and cognate forms.

Obviously imperfect as it is, this introduction to the study of the lyric and epic kinds goes forth in the persuasion that it may be of use to those who desire orientation, a systematic statement of the more general problems to be solved, a quick access to the information available for the process. Those who would naturally be interested are the college student and the teacher of literature, the investigator of literary history and theory, the reviewer, — those, in short, who make of criticism a discipline, an aim, or a profession.

The work, though voluminous, is one of first aid only; it has not the effrontery to pretend to exhaustiveness. The arrangement of subjects, the problems proposed, the means suggested for their solution, the running discussion, are for practical convenience in opening up investigation rather than for the advocacy of method or the formulation of conclusions, both of which must depend upon the scholarship and mature deliberation, the judgment and skill, of the individual. The citation of references is nowhere as complete as the compilers would wish. The same may be said of summaries of periods and movements. In particular, the period from 1850 to the present has perforce been treated all too briefly, — it demands

681997

a book to itself. To accord the minor types or varieties, such as elegy, epigram, ode, song, sonnet, idyl, or ballad, full measure of definition and outline would swell the volume out of all proportion to its intent — irrespective of the practicality of publishers, the pocketbook of purchasers, and the *annos labentes* of the authors. A detailed account of the prosody of the different types has not been included because that aspect of the study has been already considered in the first volume of the series.

Following the arrangement adopted for convenience and comprehensiveness in the former volume, each literary type or species has been considered in a twofold aspect, theoretical and historical. In each of these subdivisions the first section presents an analysis of the subject under discussion and a statement of the problems involved, with indication of the authorities most necessary to be consulted; the second section consists of a bibliography, alphabetically arranged and accompanied by annotations which aim to give the student or the prospective buyer some idea of the content and value of the work in its bearing upon the subject; and the third section supplies in outline the theory, or history, as the case may be, of the type or form under consideration as developed in various national literatures, and cites specific authorities for periods, movements, and germinative influences in poetry and criticism.

Especial attention must be called to the fact that continual repetition of the more general literary histories, bibliographies, reviews, and journals has been avoided by gathering all such works into an Appendix. Since it is too late to insert the statement in the proper place, the authors take this opportunity to say that Gayley's Principles of Poetry, occasionally cited in the text as included in Gayley and Young's English Poetry, can be found only in the editions of that volume published between 1904 and 1919. The essay will shortly be republished in an enlarged and separate form.

Doubtless some students will object to the arrangement of materials here by types as begging the question of literary classification. A preface is no place for discussing this objection. The authors can only say that they believe that types of a sort do exist, subject to gradual variation. By a constant factor are fixed the only possible moulds or channels of communication and, therefore, the primary types,—as for instance within the realm of poetry, the lyric, narrative, and dramatic. By the presence of other factors, both inconstant, namely, environment, antecedent and contemporary, and the associational congeries called the poet, these types are themselves liable to modification. The idea of a process by evolution may be unproved; but that some process, as by permutation, must obtain is recognized. The traditional terminology of literary criticism tends, indeed, to disguise, hybridize, or otherwise confuse the subtypes or species. But the authors trust that such indication of materials for further study as is given here under the traditional headings may be of assistance toward a clearer determination of species, historically as well as logically documented, and the invention for them of a more definite terminology than we now possess.

Considerable headway had been made with the writing of this book fully fifteen years ago, but it was still far from completion. For its furtherance during the last ten years the originator of the enterprise, embarrassed by the growing burden of other literary obligations and latterly of administrative duties, has been compelled to lean heavily upon the coöperation of his former pupil, present colleague, and ever present friend, Professor B. P. Kurtz. Had it not been for the scholarship and indefatigable industry of the latter, the manuscript might not have seen print for another ten years. This is but a grateful expression of indebtedness and esteem.

CHARLES MILLS GAYLEY

BERKELEY, CALIFORNIA
NOVEMBER 11, 1919

CONTENTS

PART I. THE LYRIC AND SOME OF ITS SPECIAL FORMS

CHAPTER I. THEORY AND TECHNIQUE

PAGE
§ 1. STATEMENT OF PROBLEMS; ANALYSIS 3
- I. Definitions of the Lyric 3
- II. The Nature of the Lyric 8
  - *A.* The Lyric Poet 8
  - *B.* The Lyric Subject 10
- III. The Technique of the Lyric 11
  - *A.* The Relation of Music to Language 11
  - *B.* The Form of the Lyric 11
- IV. Special Forms 13
  - *A.* Song 13
  - *B.* Hymn 17
  - *C.* Ode 17
  - *D.* Sonnet 22
  - *E.* Ballad, Idyl, and Romance 25
  - *F.* Elegy 25
  - *G.* Pastoral 30
  - *H.* Epigram 30
  - *I.* *Vers de Société* 32
  - *J.* Dramatic Lyric 33
  - *K.* Reflective Lyric 33
- V. Classification of the Lyric 34
  - *A.* The Kinds 34
  - *B.* The Stages 35
- VI. Function of the Lyric 35
  - *A.* Aesthetic Function 36
  - *B.* Ethical Function 39
- VII. The Lyric and Other Kinds of Poetry 40
- VIII. Conditions of Society Favorable to the Lyric 40

§ 2. GENERAL REFERENCES 41

PAGE
§ 3. OUTLINES OF THEORY BY NATIONALITIES: SPECIAL REFERENCES 85
I. Ancient (Greek and Roman) Theory of the Lyric . . 85
II. The Dark Ages 88
III. Italian 89
IV. French 97
V. English 111
VI. German 129
VII. Dutch and Spanish 136

CHAPTER II. HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENT

§ 4. STATEMENT OF PROBLEMS; ANALYSIS 137
I. Beginnings of the Lyric 141
II. Principles of Growth 144
A. Of Individual Lyrics in Process of Composition . 144
B. Of the Evolution of the Lyric as a Type 145
C. Influences which have Modified the Lyric . . . 146
III. Tendencies of the Lyric 146
IV. Kinds of the Lyric 147
A. Bases of Differentiation 147
B. Special Forms 149
§ 5. GENERAL REFERENCES 149
§ 6. HISTORICAL STUDY BY NATIONALITIES: SPECIAL REFERENCES 182
I. The Greek Lyric 183
II. The Roman Lyric 189
III. The Byzantine Lyric 191
IV. Christian Greek and Latin Hymns of the Dark and Middle Ages 191
V. Other Latin Christian Lyric Poetry from the 2d to the 14th Century 195
VI. Latin Poetry of the 15th and 16th Centuries 203
VII. The French (including the Provençal) Lyric 204
VIII. The Italian Lyric 225
IX. The Spanish Lyric 248
X. The Portuguese Lyric 261
XI. The English Lyric 265
XII. The Celtic Lyric (Irish, Scottish, Welsh, etc.) 306
XIII. The German Lyric 309
XIV. The Dutch Lyric 337

PAGE
XV. The Scandinavian Lyric in General 339
XVI. The Icelandic Lyric 339
XVII. The Swedish Lyric 340
XVIII. The Danish-Norwegian Lyric 345
XIX. Lyric Poetry of the Lapps and Finns 352
XX. The Russian Lyric 352
XXI. Serbian, Cheskian, Magyar, and Polish Lyrics . . 353
XXII. The Turkish Lyric 354
XXIII. The Afghan Lyric 355
XXIV. The Syriac and Armenian Lyric 355
XXV. The Lyric of Arabia 355
XXVI. The Persian Lyric 356
XXVII. The Indian Lyric 361
XXVIII. The Sumerian and Babylonian Lyric 363
XXIX. The Egyptian Lyric 364
XXX. The Ancient Hebrew Lyric 364
XXXI. The Chinese Lyric 367
XXXII. The Japanese Lyric 368
XXXIII. Lower Races 369
XXXIV. Special Forms 374
  A. The Elegy 374
  B. The Epigram 412
  C. The Ode 417
  D. The Sonnet 420
  E. The Song 421

PART II. THE EPIC AND MINOR FORMS OF NARRATIVE POETRY

CHAPTER III. THEORY AND TECHNIQUE

§ 7. STATEMENT OF PROBLEMS; ANALYSIS 423
I. Definitions of the Epic 423
II. The Nature of the Epic 431
  A. The Relation of the Poet to his Work . . . 431
  B. The Subject of the Epic 431
III. The Technique of the Epic 433
  A. The Elements (Action, Characters, Plot) . . 433
  B. The Form 436

PAGE
IV. Varieties of the Epic 436
V. Function of the Epic 437
  A. Aesthetic 437
  B. Ethical and Religious 437
  C. Historical 438
VI. Other Special Characteristics 439
VII. Minor Forms of Narrative Verse 439
  A. Ballad 440
  B. Pastoral 443
  C. Idyl 445

§ 8. GENERAL REFERENCES 453

§ 9. OUTLINES OF THEORY BY NATIONALITIES: SPECIAL REFERENCES 507

I. Greek Theory of the Epic 508
II. Roman Theory of the Epic 513
III. Latin Christian Criticism of the Dark Ages . . . 516
IV. Greek Fathers of the Church 519
V. Italian 520
VI. French 535
VII. English 555
VIII. German 575
IX. Dutch and Spanish 589
X. Sanskrit 590

CHAPTER IV. HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENT

§ 10. STATEMENT OF PROBLEMS; ANALYSIS 591

I. What is the Origin of the Epic? 591
  A. Psychological 591
  B. Historical 593
    1. Evolutionary Theory 594
    2. Individualistic Theory 595
    3. Relation to the Lyric 596
    4. Origin, Distribution, and Transformation of Epical Stories 596
II. Stages of Development 599
III. Period best Fitted to Production of Heroic Poetry and Folk Epic 600
IV. Development of the Art Epic 600

PAGE
V. Classification of the Epic 602
VI. Is the Age of Epic Composition Past? 603
VII. Sub-species of the Epic 603
VIII. Relation of Epic Proper to Allied Forms 604
IX. Minor Forms of Narrative Poetry 605
A. Ballad 605
B. Pastoral 609
C. Idyl 611

§ 11. GENERAL REFERENCES 615

§ 12. HISTORICAL STUDY BY NATIONALITIES: SPECIAL REFERENCES 668

I. The Homeric Epics 668
II. Other Greek Epics 679
III. Roman Epics 682
IV. Latin Christian Narrative Poetry to the Time of Dante 688
V. French Epics 703
VI. Italian Epics 712
VII. Spanish Epics 729
VIII. Portuguese Epics 734
IX. English Epics 736
X. Gaelic Epics 748
XI. German Epics 749
XII. The Dutch Epic and Allied Forms 765
XIII. Icelandic and Norse Epical Literature 767
XIV. Modern Scandinavian Epic, Metrical Romance, etc. 770
XV. The Finnish Epic 773
XVI. Russian, Polish, and Other Epical Materials . . . 774
XVII. Persian Epics 776
XVIII. The Indian Epic 778
XIX. The Babylonian-Sumerian Epic 782
XX. Various Other Epics and Epical Material 783
XXI. Folk Poetry and Fairy Tales 783

APPENDIX: A Brief Bibliography of the History of Poetry . . . 785

INDEX 847

METHODS AND MATERIALS OF LITERARY CRITICISM

LYRIC, EPIC, AND ALLIED FORMS OF POETRY

PART I. THE LYRIC AND SOME OF ITS SPECIAL FORMS

CHAPTER I

THEORY AND TECHNIQUE

SECTION 1. STATEMENT OF PROBLEMS; ANALYSIS

Theoretical discussion is fascinating but not final. It stirs interest and furnishes a working hypothesis. It is placed first in each part of this book because it is the older form of attack, and because it prepares the way for the concrete method of historical investigation which follows: under Lyric, in Chapter II; under Epic, in Chapter IV.

I. **Definitions of the Lyric.** As a preliminary to independent investigation, the student will naturally acquaint himself with the opinions of writers who have adopted distinctive points of view. The differences usually find their origin in the variety of bases available for the purpose of definition.

The lyric may be defined with reference to its content, or its form, or both. Content may refer subjectively and psychologically to the peculiarities of thought, feeling, will, and imagination presented in the poem, or objectively to the representation of action, characters, or situations. Under the form of the lyric are subsumed its metrical scheme and quality, its singable, melodious, or tuneful character, its relation to musical accompaniment, its length, and its division into metrical, logical, or emotional parts. In defining on a basis of content various selections or combinations of the elements involved have been made; obviously such definitions will suffer from the subtlety and ambiguity of the subjective terms on which they may be founded. If the formal basis be adopted, more definite limits may be prescribed, but at the cost of arbitrarily narrowing the lyric field and ruthlessly ignoring the inner or spiritual distinction of the type. Hence it is that many critics have preferred to adopt as basis some combination of characteristic details of form and content. Generally speaking, classical and renaissance criticism preferred the formal basis, modern philosophical and romantic criticism has emphasized the subjective content of the lyric, and recent professional criticism has either simplified the subjective test or has adopted various combinations of formal and spiritual differentiæ. Let us briefly consider these three critical tendencies.

Ancient writers of poetics paid little attention to the lyric, largely, perhaps, because of the almost purely formal conception of the type that then obtained. Among the Greeks, for instance, certain metres or complex prosodical patterns distinguished lyric verse; the three kinds of the lyric — elegiac, iambic, and melic — were easily differentiated by their metrical peculiarities. Then, too, the lyric, especially melic poetry, was always regarded as very closely connected with music, sometimes as almost synonymous with music, and in the distinctions of musical accompaniment lay further differentiations of a formal nature. It should be noted, however, that the Greek lyric could not be differenced from the epic merely by musical accompaniment, since, on the one hand, Homer and Hesiod are each represented with a lyre, and, on the other hand, elegiac and iambic verse were probably not always sung, but often recited with slight and intermittent accompaniment. Again, the Greeks classified their lyrics formally with reference to the occasions for which the poems were composed. Poems were made for almost every occasion. There were songs for the various seasons and festivals, plantings and reapings; hymns befitting each god, and severally suited to a great diversity of rituals and holidays; birth songs, wedding and funeral songs; convivial songs of various sorts; and so on (see Farnell, pp. 3, 15–18). Dedicated to many of these by formal custom and distinctive practice were, as already suggested, certain marvellously appropriate measures. And though Alexandrian and Roman poetry lost much of that sensitiveness of ear that had naturally decreed the conventions of the Greek lyric at its best, yet the traditional methods of formal differentiation survived, and were inherited by the Italian and French critics of the Renaissance. "During the Renaissance," says Spingarn, "there was no systematic lyric theory. Those who discussed it at all gave most of their attention to its formal structure, its style, and especially the conceit which it contained. The model of all lyric poetry was Petrarch, and it was in accordance with the lyrical poet's agreement or disagreement with the Petrarchan method that he was regarded as a success or a failure" (Lit. Crit. of the Renaissance, 1st ed., 1899, p. 58).—On the variety of the Greek lyric see Farnell, Flach, Jevons, and Symonds, as noted below, § 5; for a typical ancient notice of the lyric, see below, § 2, under Aristotle. For historical notices of Italian and French Petrarchism of the sixteenth century, see Egger and Piéri, § 5, and under Italy and France in the historical outlines of § 6. For examples of renaissance criticism of the lyric in Italy, Spingarn refers to Muzio, Trissino, Equicola, Ruscelli, Scaliger, Minturno,—for whom, and others, see below, § 3; renaissance criticism as a whole may be studied by means of other notices in the same section.

As an example of the philosophical critic's emphasis upon the subjective content or spiritual apprehension of the lyric, Hegel's definition (see below, § 2) may be cited. Hegel remarks that the lyric poet draws to himself all the world, subjectifies it by penetrating it with his own personal feeling, and then expresses it in forms appropriate to his subjectivity. Thus the lyric is distinguished from other major types of poetry as an utterance of personal subjectivity, emotive and imaginative. For views similar to this either in content or in the deductive method of their invention, see Carriere, Vischer, von Schelling, Richter, Wackernagel, and Batteux. Gosse points out that such a view would make Wordsworth's Excursion a lyric and Tennyson's Revenge an epic.—For other philosophical attempts at defining the lyric by means of schematic contrasts with the epic and drama, see below, VII.

Eugen Wolff, it may be noted, arrives by an inductive investigation at a somewhat simpler statement of lyric subjectivity. He finds that the peculiarity of the lyric lies in the expression of strong feeling about some significant circumstance, and in the attendant resolution, composition, or mediation (*Vermittlung*) of the emotional crisis. Compare Werner, Bruchmann, Geiger, Woodberry, Palgrave, and Alden. It should be noted in this connection that for the practical purpose of selecting poems for a collection of lyrics Palgrave's similar and simple formula, that the lyric "turns on some single thought, feeling, or situation," and is characterized in mode "by brevity, the coloring of human passion," and a commensurate "rapidity of movement," has proved by far the most apt and useful. And it should be remarked that, whereas the definition based upon the philosophical differentia of *personal* subjectivity (Hegel and other eighteenth-century German metaphysicians) must be strained beyond limit to accommodate the communal choral of primitive races, the definition of Eugen Wolff and those who are in substantial agreement with him finds, because of its broader inclusiveness, no such difficulty of application. Indeed, it is significant that the three most methodical of recent observers of the lyric, the three who have nearest approached to ideal methods of observation — Bruchmann, Geiger, and Wolff — are practically at one concerning the proper differentia of the lyric (compare Werner); and the similarity of their definition to the most convenient of all practical tests of the lyric — that of Palgrave — strengthens the presumption in favor of the substantial accuracy of their definition. Yet it must not be forgotten that the reflective lyric is possibly as primitive as the lyric of feeling (cf. Gummere, Beginnings of Poetry, p. 420).

As already indicated, there is now a tendency among professional critics to combine both the outer and the inner bases of definition by insisting upon the dual character of the lyric, — its song-like or tuneful quality or form on the one hand, and its subjective or personal content on the other (see Brunetière, F. E. Schelling, Gayley, Reed, Rhys; for a discussion of such definitions, see

Gosse, Fuller). Here the reliance on form no longer has reference, as among the ancients, to specific metrical patterns, but to a general melody that renders the lyric singable. But one difficulty in such definitions lies in the fact that in many poems that universally are called lyrics the song-like quality is not obviously present. This is particularly true of the sonnet in general, and Lycidas may serve as an example of many lyrics other than sonnets that can scarcely be said to imply a musical accompaniment. Various definitions of song-quality have been suggested to meet this difficulty. Brunetière declared that in the modern, mute lyric the quality of the original song-lyric survives in an extraordinary, supple adaptation of rhythms to the mood of the poet. This produces an effect of "inward song." Professor Gayley suggests the word "tuneful" as descriptive of this mute and inward song; compare Wordsworth (Preface, 1815) on "an animated or impassioned recitation" as taking the place of musical accompaniment. Gosse somewhat ironically takes cognizance of the musical crux when he speaks of the lyric as poetry "which is, or can be supposed to be, susceptible of being sung to the accompaniment of a musical instrument."

One other modern conception of the lyric, advanced by Jouffroy, Gosse, Fuller, Drinkwater, and others, should be noted. In despair of surmounting the philosophical vagueness of the subjective test and the practical difficulties of the song or musical test, they see in the lyric a term signifying merely the essence of poetry (see Gosse). In other words, pure poetry, that which has the essentially poetic quality, is lyric poetry; every composition becomes increasingly lyrical as it becomes more and more poetic. The more poetical a drama is, the more lyrical it is; the more poetic an epic, the more lyrical it must be. The most poetic passages in drama and epic are lyrical. Alfred Croiset writes in his La Poésie de Pindare: "Ce que nous appëlons de ce nom [la poésie lyrique] dans les littératures modernes n'est en général qu'une poésie d'une inspiration plus hardie, d'un tour plus libre, d'un rhythme plus varié, destiné à traduire des émotions plus fortes." But have we not in such a conception a mere confusion of kind and quality? The lyrical quality does indeed pervade drama and epic, and not seldom is its presence obvious in the most poetic passages. But that in no way affects the existence of the lyric as a kind separate from drama and epic. Besides, it is clearly impossible to group all poetry under these two "pragmatic" types, epic and drama. Why should the term 'lyric' be denied to a part, at least, of what is left?

But the adequacy of any of these definitions or their bases can be determined only after consideration of such questions as appear under the following divisions of this section.

II. **The Nature of the Lyric.** Approaching the problem more independently the student may proceed somewhat as follows and, regarding the questions under each head not as categorical but as provocative of further analysis and inquiry, develop a tentative theory or alternative theories of the subject under consideration.

A. *The Lyric Poet.*

1. To what extent may his **personality** be sought in his work? (*a*) Is the poet both the subject and the object of the lyric? (*b*) Can we consider his work apart from his personality? (*c*) Does the question of the lyrist's morals fall within the realm of literary criticism? On these questions see the references in the next section to Schopenhauer, Vischer, Hegel, Werner, Ulrici, Watts-Dunton, Browning. (*d*) Can it be shown that those poets who have been most possessed of lyric genius have been most emotional in temperament, or in any respect peculiarly emotional? (*e*) It should be noted that the subjective character of the lyric does not limit it to autobiographical material, for it may spring from the power of the poet to enter into the feelings of others and speak as they would. See Alden. This power may be called the *re-presentative* power of the poet as distinguished from his power of *presenting* his own emotions and ideas. Compare the 'dramatic-lyric.' (*f*) Upon the wealth of the poet's artistic personality, says Geiger, depends the value of the poem; this personality conditions both the nature and the expression of experience. Hence it follows that the "inner image" is the decisive point in the poet's experience and creation. Upon the nature and variety of the inner

image depends, therefore, the variety of states which serve the poet as the stuff of his creations (cf. below, 2, (*k*), the lyric mood).

2. What is the '**lyric mood**'? (*a*) Does it arise from "the mingling or the contrast of two conflicting principles," and if so, what are the principles? (*b*) Does it arise from the disturbance of mental tranquillity by a sense of personal unrest? or (*c*) from some "inverted action of mind upon will"? See Schopenhauer, Brockhaus, Vischer, Hegel, Mill. (*d*) Is the lyric mood essentially religious? Ulrici, Hegel. (*e*) Is it the supremely poetic emotion? the fundamental poetic inspiration, "die Seele aller Poesie"? Jouffroy, Gosse, Fuller. (*f*) Is it enthusiasm? (Batteux). Or emotion, "shared and controlled"? Compare Woodberry (Inspiration of Poetry). (*g*) What relation exists between the lyrical and the musical mood? See Lanier, Gurney, Schopenhauer, Du Prel, Watts-Dunton. (*h*) Does it always tend to personify its subject by the intensity of its realization of the subject? See Mendelssohn, Carriere (Die Poesie, pp. 373–374). (*i*) Is it more feminine in character than the epic and dramatic moods? See Bruchmann, pp. 58–68, 112. (*j*) How does the James-Lange theory of the emotions affect the theory of the lyric? See W. James, Psychology, Briefer Course, pp. 375 ff.; also, the same author's Principles of Psychology; and compare W. Wundt, Outlines of Psychology, p. 193 (Trans. by C. H. Judd, 2d ed. Leipz.: 1902). (*k*) The lyric mood may be regarded in its relation to will and thought as subjective factors conditioning feeling, and in relation to external things as objective controls of feeling. Reasoned thought, for instance, is less adapted to the lyric mood than is intuitive thought; instinctive will, as in desires, is eminently lyrical, whereas rational will is lyrical when the idea-content is concrete, as in a patriotic song. On the other hand, external objects (general situation, particular object, mankind, a particular individual) enter into the lyrical mood in proportion to the degree of feeling attached to them: if the poet's emotions are very deeply stirred, he tends to ignore the situation or other object related to his feelings; with somewhat less of emotional stress, glimpses of the related

object constitute part of his inner image and mood, and so appear in the poem; when he is but slightly moved, there occurs a fluctuation of object and emotion; when the poet is in a restful, harmonious mood, the object is of greater weight in image and mood, and is manifest in the poem itself; when the passions are scarcely stirred, the object reigns supreme in mood, image, and poem. See Geiger.

B. *The Lyric Subject.*

1. Its **Essential Character.** (*a*) The poet's own impulse or desire? (*b*) The "attempt to justify passion by idealizing its object"? (*c*) A "movement of the fancy by which the individual spirit seeks to attain broader freedom"? (*d*) Some objective condition aroused by an external stimulus? (*e*) The "identification of the poet with the object described"? (*f*) Is it the "inner music of the feelings"? (*g*) Is it some special ordering of the inspired imagination, such as the association by the imagination of images and ideas independent of a controlling reference to an objective model? Compare Mendelssohn and Engel; see also J. M. Baldwin. (*h*) Can the lyric be said to 'imitate' the invisible emotion? (*i*) Is onomatopoetic illusion characteristic of the lyric? See Lange. (*j*) On the "inner image" as affording the lyric subject, and on its varieties as determined by its relations to subjective conditions and objective controls, see above, A, 1, (*f*); 2, (*k*).

2. Its **Methods.** Wherein lies the unity of the lyric? (*a*) Is it in some "feeling which takes the place of a central idea"? (*b*) Or in some moment of passion? (*c*) Or in some conflict between, or commingling of, emotions, or of essential principles of conduct? (*d*) Or in the emotional atmosphere that invests a crisis of action? On these points see Hegel, Ulrici, Mill, Stedman, Palgrave, Lotze, Browning, Viehoff, Vischer, Watts-Dunton, Schopenhauer, Werner, von Hartmann, Gayley.

3. Its **Limitations.** (*a*) Are the moods and situations of the lyric capable of permanence? (*b*) Can the feelings expressed be anything more than particular and individual? (*c*) To what extent are the freedom, simplicity, and sincerity of the lyric limited?

(*d*) Are the occasional and the universal the upper and lower limits respectively of the lyric? And can the ancient lyric be said to be predominantly occasional, the modern predominantly universal? See below, § 5, Jevons. (*e*) Does the lyric range over the whole field of human emotion? Are misanthropy and cynicism adapted to lyric expression? See Schelling (The English Lyric, Chap. I). (*f*) Is it more difficult to translate the lyric than poems of other types? See Mill, Lotze, Hegel, Schopenhauer, Werner, Brunetière (La poésie intime, in *Rev. d. Deux Mondes*, Aug. 1, 1875), and compare the following lines:

> Das ist des Lyrikers Kunst, aussprechen was allen gemein ist,
> Wie er's im tiefsten Gemüth neu und besonders erschuf;
> Oder dem Eigensten auch solch allverständlich Gepräge
> Leihn, dass jeglicher drin staunend sich selber erkennt.
>
> E. Geibel, Gesammelte Werke (8 vols.,
> Stuttgart: 1883), vol. V, p. 36.

III. **The Technique of the Lyric.**

A. *The Relation of Music to Language.* In the practical song, such as the early chant or the modern hymn, do the words supply the idea and the music the emotion? And does the modern or 'art' lyric, by its increase of the verbal melody, tend to usurp the functions of music and lift itself above the possibility of accompaniment? See Erskine, Chap. I, and Brunetière, on the *chant intérieur*. The problem of the relation of music to poetry is particularly pertinent to the lyric: for references, see below, § 2, under Ambros. The principles of versification have been treated in Gayley and Scott, Lit. Crit., §§ 22–24; statement of problems, references, and a general note may there be found.

B. *The Form of the Lyric.*

1. In **general**, on swiftness, intensity of movement, episodes, etc., see Hegel, Watts-Dunton, Stedman; on figures, see Herder. (*a*) What kinds of metre are *a priori* preferable? (*b*) What kinds are especially affected by each of the different languages? (*c*) Is rhyme more useful here than in the other kinds of poetry? (*d*) Relative value of 'elegance,' 'formality,' poetic abandon,

Willkürlichkeit, or waywardness of rhythm? Does the lyric form tend toward brevity, and if so is this because the lyric is the expression of inconstant feeling-states? Geiger.

2. **Form as internal structure** (motivation, development, etc.). (*a*) How is the ballad differentiated from the song by the motive of narration in the former? (*b*) Is there a 'lyric unit'? (*c*) Is unity of emotion in the lyric comparable to unity of action in the drama? Has the lyric, as the expression of a single emotion, a more absolute unity than any of the other kinds of poetry? (*d*) Does the lyric always begin by reproducing the cause or stimulus of its emotion? (*e*) Does this stimulus or motive remain distinct, or is it absorbed into the poem? When the poet is deeply moved does he ignore the stimulus or object of his emotion, while absorbed in the expression of the emotion itself? When he is not deeply moved does the object (person or situation) of the emotion tend to appear more definitely in the poem? (*f*) Does the lyric end with or before the subsidence of the emotional excitement? (*g*) Are the emotional stimulus and the subject of the lyric necessarily identical? (*h*) Consider the following statement: "If the original stimulus does not . . . control and sustain the emotion, the lyric either breaks down entirely, or else separates into fragments, each a complete lyric unit in itself" (Erskine, p. 14). (*i*) Consider the following account of lyric structure, based upon the relation of the lyric to the outer and the inner worlds.

> Simplest of all is the lyric that remains in the outer world, though it expresses the inner emotion aroused by it; an example of this type is the old English [Cuckoo Song], which begins and ends with the coming of summer and the cuckoo. More familiar is the lyric which takes its beginning at a point in the outer world, but passes to the invisible world of emotional reflection; of this type a great example is Keats's Ode on a Grecian Urn, which takes its point of departure at the visible object, and passes to profoundly emotional reflection on the immortality of the spirit of beauty. Or, still further, we may have the lyric which is wholly of the inner life, like certain of Shakespere's sonnets (for example, that beginning "Poor soul, the center of my sinful earth"). Lyrics of this last type are most likely to be reflective, and hence to move furthest away from the pure or *song* type (Alden, p. 58).

(*j*) To what extent is the idyl made up of a series of lyrics, each separate picture affording a lyrical stimulus? (*k*) Does the force of the emotion naturally adjust the length of the lyric? On these points, see Erskine, Geiger, Alden, Hepple, Werner, Gottschall, Vischer, Viehoff.

For notes on the technique of special forms of the lyric see under the next division, IV.

IV. **Special Forms.** In the following enumeration no attempt has been made to proceed by logical division of the lyric field. Such division (see the attempts by Werner and Moulton) can be intelligently undertaken by the student only after he has acquainted himself with the variety of kinds most frequently practised and mentioned, and critically recognized because of the sanction of long custom. The subtypes, forms, or kinds here presented for brief notice are neither mutually exclusive nor collectively exhaustive of the species. Principles of classification will be considered under V, below. Here mere hints can be given (which, however, may be developed in the light of the suggestions outlined in the sections on lyric theory in general), and a few references that may open the way to individual research.

A. *Song.* The improvised lyric song, communal or individual, popular or artistic, is probably the simplest and most spontaneous form of lyric expression. From it as a perpendicular the various special forms might be diagrammed as declensions toward the horizontal of the conscious, reflective lyric that is practically without musical adaptability (see K, below). The true song is primarily the instinctive outburst of emotion or emotional thought in language which by aptness of word and rhythm echoes or suggests the underlying emotion and by melody of line and harmony of stanza is adapted to such modulations of the singing voice as naturally distinguish emotional utterance. The words must be simple and, at the same time, rich in connotation and sensuous. The rhythm must reproduce the urgency and speed, the flow and ebb, of the dominant feeling, on the one hand emphasizing the movement by the regularity of metre, on the other avoiding rigidity. The melody must be facile in its consonant-sequences, preferably open in the quality and varied in the musical pitch of its vowel sounds. The harmony, whether of end-rhyme or other correspondence of sounds within the stanza, should be artistically varied, but so obvious as to be readily apprehended, even anticipated by the ear. The more familiar, or at any rate unforced, the rhyming and metrical scheme, the better. The appeal is not to intellect or will, at least not in the first instance, but to feeling — "deep calleth unto deep" — and the nearer the burden of the song, the imaginative vesture of the conception, and the musical art of the utterance to the common feeling and experience of the race, the more instinctively does "knowledge answer to knowledge," the reader or hearer respond to the mood of the poet and sing it understandingly for and of himself. The song is, therefore, more than any other lyric kind a musical 'cry.' The treatment of the mood, image, or thought is accordingly subjective, suggestive rather than expressive, implicit rather than enumerative, and of the wingèd swiftness and brevity appropriate to the nature of the peculiar 'cry.' The structure of stanzas or strophes also has its affinity to music. Indeed so intimate is the connection with music that song demands and receives as much attention as a branch of that art as of poetry; and in the dictionaries of music some of the best analysis and most helpful criticism is to be found.

The term 'song' is applied to an immense poetic and musical demesne. In the parlance of the latter, indeed, it refers to any short poem, whether lyrical, narrative, or reflective, set to music; the ballad, for instance, is often spoken of as a song. But even short of such extension of the term its denotation is immense, since man has always been accustomed on the greatest variety of occasions to break into brief songs of which a large majority are almost as wingèd and ephemeral as the singing word itself. It follows that an adequate division of this practically illimitable field is impossible, — at the best arbitrary and fruitless. The musician adopts a differentiation between songs intended for one voice or a unisonous chorus (homophonic songs) and those sung in parts, such as glees and madrigals (polyphonic songs). The German historian is fond of the division into popular or folk song (*Volkslied*) and artistic song (*Kunstlied*); but, since it is often impossible to determine into which of the classes a song may fall, this division indicates origin or tendency rather than a fixed and definite distinction. If occasion or subject be taken as the principle of division, exhaustive enumeration and clean partition are difficult to secure. But in spite of the overlapping of such subheads as love songs, mocking songs, drinking songs, working songs, magical songs or charms, religious, festival, or seasonal songs, patriotic songs, elegiac songs, war songs, political songs, moral songs, and dance songs, and their failure jointly to cover the field of lyric occasion and subject, they yet afford the most satisfactory classification for the general purposes of description and rough identification. From the historical point of view modern European song has been usually traced through three stages: the medieval of Provençal origin, with the respective national developments, the later popular, and the later artistic. The second and third of these divisions correspond roughly to historical sequence, since with the sophistication of emotion and thought in later ages the artistic lyric tends to take the place, among the upper classes, of the popular lyric.

The student of song in its national development will be interested in tracing in individual literatures the variety and nomenclature of special forms. He will inquire to what extent these national varieties possess common or peculiar characteristics, and with what persistency of national trait in subject and treatment. The mere enumeration of kinds and descriptive terms is a task in itself. The Greeks, for instance, possessed scores of songs differentiated by occasion, some of which were choral (more properly called odes), others non-choral or monodic. The greater number of their non-choral songs were convivial (*paroenia*, *scolia*; Terpander the reputed inventor). Among other songs, partly monodic, partly choral, may be mentioned the famous *chelidonisma*, or swallow song, the flower song, the *threnos*, or dirge, the didactic *nomos*, and such seasonal songs as the *Linus*, *Adonis*, *Hyacinthus*, and *Lityerses* songs (see Flach, Farnell, and other references below, § 6, I, The Greek Lyric). And in modern Europe a somewhat similar diversity is found. Just a few of the Provençal-French types, for instance, are the *alba* and *serena* (morning song and serenade), the *sirvente* (the address of the devoted servant of love to his mistress), the *tenson*, or dispute about a point of gallantry, the pastoral erotic song known as *pastourelle*, the melancholy *lai*, dancing songs such as the *ballettes*, or the *rondet de carol*, or the *espringerie* (jumping dance song); later, we have in France up to the sixteenth century the gradual crystallization of early forms in the *chanson*, *vaudeville*, *noel*, *madrigal*, *rondeau*, *rondel*, *triolet*, *villanelle*, *ballade*, *sestina*, *chant-royal*, *pantoum*; and, in the revolutionary days of 1798 and 1830, a host of political and artistic songs of varieties old and new. Among the great modern writers of songs Hugo, Béranger, Lamartine, de Musset, de Banville, and Delavigne may be mentioned. See the section by M. A. Jeanroy in vol. I of Petit de Julleville's Hist. de la langue et de la littérature française, where further bibliography will be found; see also, on French poems, de Gramont, Les vers français et leur prosodie (Paris), and Th. de Banville, Petit traité de poésie française (Paris: 1881), and below, § 6, VII, The French Lyric: on English imitations of French song metres see Austin Dobson, Foreign Forms of Verse, in W. D. Adams' Latter-Day Lyrics (Lond.: 1878); Tom Hood the Younger, The Rhymester (ed. "Arthur Penn," N.Y.: 1882); E. W. Gosse, Plea for Certain Exotic Forms of Verse (in *Cornhill*, July, 1877); G. Saintsbury, History of English Prosody (vol. III, 387–391. Lond.: 1910); C. M. Gayley, Principles of Poetry; and Alden, Introd. to Poetry. Among Italian forms are the *ballate* and *intuonate* (amatory dance songs), the *maggiolate* or May-day songs, the *canti carnascialeschi* (carnival songs), the *villanelle*, *frottole*, *madrigali*, and the three principal forms of the amatory *canti popolari*, viz., the *strambotto*, *stornello*, and *rispetto*; also *canzoni* of many varieties, such as the Petrarchan, Pindaric, Anacreontic, religious; and the *canti nazionali*, patriotic-political, dating from the modern national revival (see Symonds, Lit. of Ital. Renaissance, vol. I, pp. 261 ff., and references below, § 6, VIII, The Italian Lyric, A, J).

Further enumeration would be useless, since the student may easily turn to works where fuller information abounds. For bibliography of the subject, covering Spain, Portugal, England, Scandinavia, Hungary, Russia, and the Slavonic nations, and, most important among later artistic developments, Germany, see the article Song by Mrs. Edmond (A. H.) Wodehouse in Grove's Dictionary of Music and Musicians, vol. III (Lond.: 1883), which also cites some of the older authorities. See also Burney's Hist. of Music, Ambros' Geschichte der Musik, and the Oxford Hist. of Music. Articles on Song in the encyclopedias also are helpful (Encyc. Brit., with bibliographical note, Larousse, etc.). The long article *Lied* in Blankenburg-Sulzer (cited below, § 2) contains extensive references (critical and historical) from the Ancient Greeks down to the close of the 18th century in Europe. Similar lists in Quadrio (cited § 2). J. G. Jacobi's Abhandlung über das Lied und den Ursprung des Liedes (in *Iris*, vols. VI–VIII. 1776) may also be mentioned.

On English song see the monographs of Erskine, Schelling, and Reed (cited § 2), in the bibliographical appendices to which will be found many references both critical and historical, and also lists of song-anthologies. On German song see Reissmann, Gesch. des deutschen Liedes (1874); Schneider, Das musikalische Lied (1863). In general on the song, its kinds, qualities, virtues, etc., see Watts-Dunton (Encyc. Brit., Poetry), Hegel, Vischer, von Hartmann, Carriere, Lotze, Saintsbury (Hist. Eng. Prosody), and the references to Abbott and Seeley, Lanier, Mayor, Schipper, etc., given and discussed in Gayley and Scott, §§ 22–24. For suggestions on the historical study of the song, see below, § 6, XXXIV, E, The Song.

B. *Hymn.* On the hymn, a special type of the song, see below, § 6, IV, Christian Greek and Latin Hymns; XI, The English Lyric, G; XIII, The German Lyric, D–G.

C. *Ode.* The ode may be regular or irregular in *form*. The regular ode, descending from the ancient Dorian odes of Pindar and his school, is distinguished by a composition unit of three stanzas known as strophe, antistrophe, and epode, — this unit being repeated until the poem is complete. "The strophe or 'turn' and the antistrophe or 'counter-turn' were chanted by the Greek chorus of singers as they moved up one side of the orchestra and came down the other; the epode was chanted after they came to a 'stand.'" There was elaborate musical accompaniment. Strophe and antistrophe correspond in form; the epode is in another but complementary form. The technique of these stanzas is complex and intricate but definitely patterned. In the ancient ode they fall in the sequence enumerated above, but in modern imitations their positions have often been transposed. Another form of regular ode is derived from the Aeolian school and is known as the Anacreontic or, from Horace who cultivated it and handed it down, the Horatian. It is dignified in subject, exalted in style, and enthusiastic in tone; but it is an ode merely by courtesy, for in form it uses the same stanza throughout and a simple one at that; and it lacks the elaboration of 'turn,' 'counter-turn,' and 'stand.' Technically it may be called the stanzaic ode. In England it was first cultivated with success by Drayton and Jonson. — The irregular ode (a modern invention, descending from the experiments of Cowley, who did not detect the complex regularity of the Pindaric ode but conceived it to be an unsystematic strain of unpremeditated passion) is distinguished by complete liberty of line, rhyme, and stanza, and by an audacious intention to recognize as the only law of expression, the mood, imagination, and shifting gust of the *furor poeticus*.

With regard to the form of the regular ode many questions arise. (1) Is there any ascertainable limit of length? Does its elevated style render the ode more capable of sustained interest and effect than other lyric forms? (2) Are the best effects gained by intellectual and metrical balancing of the strophes? Is some regular distribution of thought between the two strophes, as in the octave and sestet of a sonnet, generally desirable? (3) Should the epode echo the strophes, or resolve their problem or motive, or mitigate their passion, or increase their passion and suspense? Should there be a flow and ebb of thought, feeling, and harmony, with the crest of the wave between the strophes and the epode? Are such effects rendered impossible by placing the epode between the strophes, and if so what other effects are gained by such arrangement? Should the epode be more regular in form than the strophes, or more varied? (4) By what is the actual construction of each stanza dictated — caprice of the poet or "the inevitableness of emotional expression"? If it be held that every detail, even to the finest shadings, of the stanzaic pattern — feet, length and number of lines, rhyme scheme, etc. — is or should be the inexorable arrangement dictated by the emotional storm of the poet (see Watts-Dunton, Encyc. Brit., Poetry), can any trustworthy verdict be rendered concerning the success (inevitability) of so subjective a form? Can another person be trusted to tell us what were the nuances of the poet's fleeting emotions, and whether they were expressed in fitting patterns? And does not the very repetition of an intricate pattern in two successive strophes destroy the theory of emotional inevitability? Otherwise we should have to suppose that twice in succession (and no more) the poet of the regular ode passes through an identical sequence of exceedingly complex and fleeting emotional nuances; and that he is capable of this sequence even when the subject matter is *not* identical in the two cases. Is it not wiser to attribute the invention of stanzaic patterns to the educated and judicial taste of the poet, who proceeds to some extent intuitively, but also with a very conscious criticism of adequacy in details and of total effect, and whose success depends upon the supple and subtle adaptation of his lines to a discoverable progress of thought and feeling? The relative appropriateness of form to thought in the greater English, French, and German odes constitutes an excellent subject for study. (5) To what degree can the metrical form of the ode arouse and satisfy in the reader an expectancy of ear? Common patterns, such as the Petrarchan or Shakesperian sonnet, afford the ear this pleasurable anticipation of rhyme, line grouping, and conclusion; but the ode is characterized by invention of unique stanzaic patterns. Is the ear able to carry forward expectantly an intricate pattern from its first utterance in one strophe to its repetition in the corresponding strophe? and should the poet provide for similar cadences and lengths in the corresponding parts of his strophes (all strophes, or only each pair?) which the alert ear will either anticipate or at least pleasurably recognize? Or is the unique and complex character even of the regular ode fundamentally unsuited to awaken and satisfy this pleasure of expectancy?

In *spirit* the ode is stately, imposing, elaborate; for the most part it retains the dignity and sonorous harmony of the ancient chant, frequently suggesting a musical delivery. In its regular form it "lends itself to the expression of enthusiasm, of passion under control, of elevated, highly imaginative reflection, of panegyric and elegy." Gosse (English Odes) has defined it as "any strain of enthusiastic and exalted lyrical verse, directed to a fixed purpose, and dealing progressively with one dignified theme." For Sharp's definition, see below, § 2. It is distinguished by quickness of movement and variety of matter, the thought and illustration springing from point to point with unflagging energy.

The ideal *content*, as already indicated, is highly imaginative and varied, whether the purpose be the celebration of some occasion or merely the development of an idea. The extent to which it fashions and embroiders ideas with descriptive figure, narrative picture, and emotional color, the fullness of acclamation and apostrophe with which it seeks to emphasize ideas, have led some critics to regard the ode as one of the most intellectual forms of the lyric; but 'most imaginative' would perhaps be a better description.

Obviously the regular ode is peculiarly the province of the poetic genius who is at once original, plastic, and critical: original, because patterns must be created adequately expressive of novel and highly imaginative thought; plastic, because there must be capability to conform to the patterns self-imposed as well as the ability to compose them in apparent freedom from conventional restraint; critical, because the flow of verse must be such as will naturally and subtly accommodate itself to the thought of at least two successive stanzas. Finally, to what degree does the poet express his subjective personality in the ode? Upon the degree to which the poet subordinates himself to his material, or vice-versa, Hegel has based a classification of odes (compare Carriere and Vischer).

Among the best English writers of the regular ode are Jonson (Pindaric Ode on the death of Sir H. Morrison), Congreve, Collins (e.g. Ode to Liberty), Gray (Progress of Poesy).

The irregular, Cowleyan ode, more chaotic than plastic, only slightly, if at all, capable of arousing metrical expectancy, mysteriously ordered by the subjective storm-caprice of uncontrolled passion, and to the tyro precarious in the undertaking because so easily reduced, and reducing, to absurdity, is yet in the hands of great poets (such as Dryden, Wordsworth, Tennyson) a noble instrument, peculiarly adapted to the utterance of novel, mysterious, and protracted harmonies. It is precisely because he is able to expatiate without trammel in an atmosphere of vastness and mystery that the successful writer of the Cowleyan ode is justified in dispensing with the principles of repetition and common expectancy upon which the melodies of a more familiar realm depend. On the anti-social character of the tendency to extreme irregularity, see the remarks and references of Alden, pp. 348–349. For still another kind of irregular ode written in distant imitation of the choruses of Greek tragedy, see the attempts of Milton, M. Arnold, Swinburne.

For stages in the development of the ode, see below, § 6, XXXIV, C, The Ode.

On the ode, its nature, origin, stanzaic or emotional law, and other questions broached above, see Hegel, Vischer, Carriere, Herder, Wackernagel, Watts-Dunton (Encyc. Brit., Poetry); Boeckh, Dissen, Mommsen, and Bergk on Pindar, Gildersleeve's Pindar, Mezger's Pindar's Siegeslieder, Fennell's Pindar, Bury's Nemean and Isthmian Odes, J. H. H. Schmidt's Die Kunstformen der griech. Poesie, W. Christ's Gesch. der griech. Litt. (under Pindar), Symonds' Pindar (in Greek Poets), and monographs by Villemain, L. Schmidt, G. Lübbert, and A. Croiset; E. Gosse (Encyc. Brit., Ode; also, Introd. to his English Odes, 1881; and his Gray in E. M. L., Chap. VI, The Pindaric Odes); Alden, William Sharp (Introd. to his Great Odes), W. C. Bronson (Introd. to Collins's Poems, Athenæum Press), W. J. Courthope (Hist. English Poetry, III, 343–349, on Cowley's Pindarics), Dryden and Samuel Johnson on Cowley, Coventry Patmore (Preface to The Unknown Eros), Swinburne (Essays and Studies), G. Saintsbury (History of English Prosody, vol. II, 337–342, 381–382, 402–406, 425, 511–519, and in vol. III, *passim*, and in History of Criticism, vol. II); also, among older critical notices, W. Congreve, Discourse on the Pindarique Ode (1705); E. Young, Discourse on Odes (1725); Houdard de la Motte, Discours sur la poésie en général, et sur l'ode en particulier, prefixed to his odes in the first volume of his works (Paris: 1753); Marmontel (Poet. franç., vol. II, Chap. xv); Sabatier, Discours sur l'ode (prefixed to his Odes, Paris: 1766); also under § 3, IV, C, D, below; the numerous 'Poetics' from Horace down, many of which are mentioned below, §§ 3, 9, etc.; several minor monographs listed by Blankenburg-Sulzer at the head of the article Ode. See also the references on Pindaric versification given in Gayley and Scott, § 24, and the general references, §§ 22–24.

D. *Sonnet.* So much that is readily accessible has been written on the character of the sonnet, and the essential features of theoretical discussion have been so clearly and concisely presented by T. Watts-Dunton (Art. Sonnet, Encyc. Brit.) that extended notice is here quite unnecessary.

The discussion of technique centers upon questions among which the following are perhaps salient: Which variety of the sonnet (Petrarchan, Shakesperian, Miltonic, Wordsworthian; for definitions of forms see any modern treatise on poetics) is most successful, most pleasing in effect? If the pleasurable effect of the sonnet depends upon the observance of a prescribed form so that the educated ear may learn to expect or anticipate certain sounds and metrical phrases as belonging to the sonnet, does it not follow that only the well-established variations of that form can supply this effect, and that miscellaneous, capricious, and experimental forms fall short of the effect just because they lack currency? What variety of harmony and thought is to be detected in the different forms, especially with regard to the separation or *enjambement* of octave and sestet? In dealing with this question the student should contrast the "wave-effect," sonority, and "metrical counterpoint" of the Petrarchan arrangement, which involves a sharp metrical and intellectual division between octave and sestet, with the "linked sweetness long drawn out" of the three quatrains and the bell-like ring of the concluding couplet that belong to the Shakesperian form (see Watts-Dunton). Of the technique of the Petrarchan variety Watts-Dunton says:

> The crowning difficulty and the crowning triumph of the sonnet writer has always been to so handle the rhythm of the prescribed structure as to make it seem in each individual sonnet the inevitable and natural rhythm demanded by the emotion which gives the individual sonnet birth, and this can perhaps only be achieved when the richness and apparent complexity of the rhyme-arrangement is balanced by that perfect lucidity and simplicity of syntax which is the special quest of the "sonnet of flow and ebb."

With regard to the subject and mood appropriate to the sonnet the most cursory observation reveals a range of possibilities much broader than might be expected from the comparatively narrow restriction of technique. From the original love theme the sonnet has passed to the treatment of death, friendship, religion, pastoral life, war, politics, etc., — in fact of almost any aspect of nature or of human life; in mood and method it has been not solely reflective, but also lyrically passionate, descriptive, narrative. Is it not, perhaps, in the artistic restraint of emotion and the careful selection of details of subject-matter, both necessitated by the prescription of form and the brevity of the sonnet, that its characteristic mood and content are found? Does not the sonnet "veil the too fervid spontaneity and reality of the poet's emotion," so that he "can whisper, as from behind a mask, those deepest secrets of the heart which could otherwise only find expression in purely dramatic forms"?

The student will of course observe the necessity of determining to what extent the general outlines of lyric theory, already noted, are applicable to the sonnet, — what is, in other words, its relation to the lyric genius or spirit. Is it the "least song-like of all brief lyrics"? the touchstone of poetic genius (Menzini)? Is its prevalence in any age a sign of the growth of a vigorous poetical taste (articles in *Dublin Review*, 1876, 1877)? or is it frequently a symptom of an artificial age?

As an attempt to suggest in brief space the characteristics of the sonnet, and as furnishing further material for discussion, the following, by way of exposition, may be quoted:

> Like a cameo it is small of compass, rich in material, delicate and conventional of detail. The thought or mood must be significant and lucid, a poetical unit, single in its emotional and imaginative effect. The octave bears the burden; a doubt, a problem, a reflection, a query, an historical statement, a cry of indignation or desire, a vision of the ideal. The sestet eases the load, resolves the problem or doubt, answers the query, solaces the yearning, realizes the vision. It gilds thought with the tracery of instance, crowns it with the sufficient and inevitable actuality that lies within the wisdom of art. Hence the larger movement of the octave; but also for simplicity and unity of effect the limitation to two rhymes, for force the repetition of the inner couplets, and for suspense the reluctant sweep, in the first, fourth, fifth, and eighth lines, of the outer harmony. Hence, too, the briefer but more varied sound-scheme of the sestet; for the skilful and rapid interweaving of rhymes counterbalances the previous hesitancy, enriches the music, and enhances the climactic effect. . . . From what has been said, it will, of course, appear that while the thought of the sonnet is progressive it takes breath, as it were, between the octave and the sestet. But this pause need not be a period, nor need it occur only at the end of the eighth line. More artistic in my opinion is the practice of those who suffer the octave to push one or two waves over the edge of the sestet. Such encroachment, or, to change the figure, *enjambement*, occurs in nearly all of Milton's sonnets (C. M. Gayley, The Principles of Poetry, pp. lxxxvi–lxxxvii, in Gayley and Young, *op. cit.* § 2).

The author's opinion concerning the concluding couplet, which he approves in the 'fourteener,' or Shakesperian, sonnet but condemns in "sonnets of the legitimate form," is open to question. It is certainly at variance with that of Watts-Dunton and some other critics of the sonnet.

For further references on the sonnet see Gayley and Scott, pp. 504–505 (Schipper, Hunt and Lee, David Main, Mark Pattison, W. Sharp, C. Tomlinson, S. Waddington, T. Hall Caine, Rosenkranz, Viehoff, Wackernagel, Gottschall, Lentzner, Capel Lofft, French, articles in *Dublin Review*, L. de Veyrières, Biadene, Welti), and add: the anthologies of R. F. Housman and of Dyce; two articles in the *Quarterly*

Review of 1866; an article in the *Westminster Review* of 1871; H. C. Beeching, The Sonnets of Shakespeare; Corson's Primer of English Verse; M. F. Crow, Elizabethan Sonnet-Cycles; John Dennis, English Sonnets; Sidney Lee, on the sonnet in Arber's English Garner; J. A. Noble, The Sonnet in England; A. T. Quiller-Couch, English Sonnets; T. R. Price, The Technic of Shakespeare's Sonnets, in Studies in Honor of Basil Gildersleeve (Baltimore: 1902); S. Waddington, English Sonnets by Poets of the Past; Archbishop Trench, an edition of Wordsworth's sonnets; C. Asselineau, Le Livre des Sonnets; Alden, Gummere, Saintsbury, Sharp, and Symonds, as noted below, § 2. For references on the history of the sonnet, many of which (especially Erskine, Schelling, Reed, Rhys, Courthope) contain valuable remarks on technique, see below, § 5.

E. On the extent to which *Ballad*, *Idyl*, and *Romance* may be lyrical, see Hegel, Carriere, Gummere, ten Brink, Sir Walter Scott, Child; compare Wordsworth on the lyrical ballad. On the Ballad, see below, § 7, VII, A; on the Idyl, below, § 7, VII, C.

F. *Elegy.* It is especially difficult to speak of the general characteristics of the elegy because of the extraordinary variation of the subtype as respects both content and form. Speaking of this variation Professor Mackail says:

> As in the heroic hexameter the Asiatic colonies of Greece invented the most fluent, stately, and harmonious metre for continuous narrative poetry which has yet been invented by man, so in the elegiac couplet they solved the problem, hardly a less difficult one, of a metre which would refuse nothing, which could rise to the occasion and sink with it, and be equally suited to the epitaph of a hero or the verses accompanying a birthday present, a light jest or a great moral idea, the sigh of a lover or the lament over a perished Empire (Select Epigrams from the Greek Anthology, p. 6. Lond.: 1890).

Indeed, the first difficulty is to know just what poems should be studied under the general head 'elegy,' — (1) all poems in elegiac measure (distich), (2) all plaintive poems, (3) all plaintive poems that are in distichs, — or all poems that fall under any of these three classes? As a matter of fact, the student will soon discover that among the ancients the term 'elegy' had reference primarily to a certain metrical pattern (distich of dactylic hexameter and pentameter), whereas among the moderns it refers primarily to a plaintive content. Perhaps the best method is to begin with the earliest Greek elegiac poetry and thence trace the numerous ramifications of the type. The historical details of this variation are treated below (§ 6, XXXIV, A, The Elegy); it will be sufficient, then, to mention here only some of the more outstanding traits of the elegy in antiquity and in modern times. Where names of authorities are given without titles see § 2 or § 5 for further information.

1. In approaching the **Ancient Elegy** the student may consider (1) its relation to the epic. Did the Greek elegy of the old Ionian and Dorian schools (see below, § 6, XXXIV, A) stand on a boundary line between epic, objective presentation of events and characters and lyric, subjective interpretation? The theory that derives the elegy from a combination of the hexameter line of the epic with the *elegos* or lament-song of the Phrygians gives color to this question. See Wackernagel, Bernhardy, Mure, Carriere (Die Kunst 2: 116), Boeckh; cf. Plessis, Flach (Cap. 3). Has the ancient elegy more of epic description than the modern? If dignity and elevation are characteristic of the older Greek elegy may these traits be traced to epical influence? (2) What are the principal moods of the ancient elegy? They have been summarized as threnodic, hortatory (in relation to war and politics), erotic, and didactic. See K. F. Smith. To what extent are these moods reflective? Is the didactic mood alone reflective? Is the elegiac distich peculiarly suited to reflection, — the hexameter to epic description and the pentameter to a self-contained reflection? Is any one of the moods — the threnodic, perhaps, or the erotic — more generally characteristic of the classical elegy than the others? Or, rather, are we to consider that the essential character of the elegy is its plaintiveness, whether of love or death, of personal disappointment or deprivation, or, more generally, in relation to the vanities of life or the departed glories of a city, state, etc.? Can it be held that all other moods, such as the patriotic and hortatory, the didactic and epistolary, the witty and epigrammatic, do not belong to the elegy proper? The history of the elegy

would appear to negative such an assumption. Is the transitory aspect of all earthly things the essential tone or idea of the elegy? May it be said that the limits of the elegy are the epic, on the one hand, and reflective poetry, on the other? (3) It would seem to be true, in general, that the emotion of the later Greek and the Roman elegy is not expressed simply, spontaneously, but formally and elaborately; and that therefore this form of poetry is not necessarily the immediate result of a strong emotion. Can exceptions to this rule be found in the elegies of Propertius? Compare the modern elegy. (4) With the exception of the narrative elegy, is the ancient elegy prevailingly subjective? Is it reasonable to trace this lyric subjectivity to the passing of the monarchical form of government in Greece and a resultant development of individual consciousness? See Boeckh, Müller, Carriere, Mahaffy, Farnell, Jevons, etc. (5) To what extent does the ancient elegy idealize the past? Is such idealization equally characteristic of the Greek, Hellenic, and Roman elegy? Is the threnodic inclination of the elegy connected with this idealization? (6) Does the realistic view of some of the Alexandrian and Roman elegies mark a decline in the ideality of the type, or its reinvigoration? Does the 'return-to-nature' movement of sophisticated Alexandrian life express itself just as effectively in idyl as in elegy? Is the contemplation of nature especially conducive to the threnodic mood? To what extent is the ancient pastoral elegy both sincere and imaginative in the expression of its mood? Compare the modern pastoral elegy: consider the character of the various social environments from which the pastoral elegy has successively sprung; do they show common traits, significant in relation to the pastoral elegy? (7) What rhetorical and figurative forms are especially favored by the ancient elegy? Does not the distich naturally encourage parallelism and antithesis? (8) Does the elegy treat an episode only — usually the most significant episode (acme or catastrophe) of an action? And does not the lyric-subjective element impose a certain characteristic brevity and unity? Wackernagel, Carriere. (9) Compare the elegy with the idyl in respect of epic arrangement, selection of episodes, descriptive effects, suggestion of character, dramatic method; with the song and ode in respect of the superior unity of the former and the sketchy, or more diffusive, method of the latter. What are the relative degrees of objectivity in song, ode, and elegy? Wackernagel, Gottschall, Carriere, Plessis.

2. Turning to the **Modern Elegy**, with its bases in the Christian Latin elegy of the Dark and Middle Ages, in the vernacular elegiac songs of the Middle Ages, and in the Renaissance elegy, the student will reasonably extend the questions of the last paragraph to the new field in order to determine just how far the modern elegy follows or diverges from the ancient. It is scarcely necessary, therefore, to suggest to him further topics for study, since a full answer to those questions will carry one a long way toward a realization of the peculiarities of the modern type. In general two distinctive tendencies will, however, be noted in the more modern field: first, an inclination to narrow the range of elegiac subjects to sorrow and death, at the expense of the hortatory, erotic, and didactic moods; second, in the treatment of plaintive and threnodic subjects, an extension of form so varied and elastic that the old elegiac metre is ultimately superseded by other and more native measures. The causes of these two tendencies and the rationale of their interrelation are provocative of speculation and research. Whether any necessary relation can, *a priori*, be adduced between the narrowing of the subject and the diversification of the form is open to question. May not the contrast be a result of separate and unrelated historical conditions? See below, § 6, XXXIV, A.

The prevailing modern conception of the elegy is that of a "reflective lyric suggested by the fact or fancy of death. The emotion, personal or public, finds utterance in keen lament, to be allayed, however, by tranquil consideration of the mutability of life, the immutability of Something that justifies life and death" (Gayley). But "in some instances classical usage has been followed in applying the term to poems including a wide variety of subjects," as the elegies of Donne and Goethe. The narrower interpretation of the term is met in Dante's definition: "By elegy we understand the style of those in misfortune" (De Vulgari Eloquio). Compare Minturno, Ronsard, and Boileau on the elegy. Coleridge took a broader view when he said, "Elegy is the form of poetry natural to the reflective mind. It *may* treat of any subject, but it must treat of no subject *for itself*, but always and exclusively with reference to the poet himself. As he will feel regret for the past or desire for the future, so sorrow and love become the principal themes of the elegy. Elegy presents everything as lost and gone, or absent and future. The elegy is the exact opposite of the Homeric epic, in which all is purely external and objective, and the poet is a mere voice. The true lyric is subjective too; but then it delights to present things as actually existing and visible, although associated with the past, or colored highly by the subject of the ode itself" (Table Talk, Oct. 23, 1833). At the close of the eighteenth century the French emphasized the erotic strain of the elegy, but later the term came to signify for them a gentle melancholy or *tendresse* in contemplating life. As André Chénier said:

> Mais la tendre élégie et sa grâce touchante
> M'ont séduit; l'élégie à la voix gémissante,
> Aux ris mêlés de pleurs, aux longs cheveux épars,
> Belle, levant au ciel ses humides regards.

Chaussard, rather appropriately, describes elegy as the sister of tragedy; Taine, in an epigram, calls it the sister of satire, since it weeps for the oppressed, whereas satire attacks the oppressor. The term 'dirge' should perhaps be reserved for a short poem embodying a lamentation more immediate and less reflective than the elegy. See Alden, Carriere, Gummere, Gosse, Gottschall, Lloyd, Hegel, Vischer, Wackernagel, etc. For Schiller's attempt to fix the meaning of the term 'elegiac' philosophically, see his Simple and Sentimental Poetry.

When the student is able to pass in review the entire field of the elegy, ancient and modern, he will be disposed to ask whether in general this form has not been especially congenial to poets of imaginative and emotional sensibility rather than of great genius. He should consider such poets as Callimachus, Tibullus, Propertius, Ovid, Parny, Chénier, Millevoye, Lamartine, Musset, Vigny, Lorenzo de' Medici, Politian, Sannazaro, Vittoria Colonna, Filicaja, Drummond of Hawthornden, Donne, Gray, Shenstone, Matthew Arnold, and William Watson; but he should remember that the greater poets, also, have found occasion for elegiacal expression, — Dante, for instance, and Milton, Goethe, Hugo, Shelley, Tennyson, Swinburne, etc.

For further study the student is advised to focus upon elegy the general theory of the lyric. He may bring the larger problems to bear by substituting 'elegy' for 'lyric' in the statement of various vital questions propounded in the previous parts of this chapter.

G. Of lyrics that are *pastoral* in subject special study may be made. The elegy has shown an affinity for the pastoral, as has also, in a less degree, the song — especially the medieval troubadour's amatory song (e.g. the *pastourelle*), which is perhaps only the homologue of the ancient erotic pastoral elegy. For general references on pastoral poetry, see below, § 10, IX, B, Pastoral.

H. *Epigram.* Without classification there can be no true definition, since the major term of a definition is the genus or class to which belongs the species about to be defined. Now the variety of poems termed epigrams is so vast as to defy satisfactory classification according to either content or form. In subject the epigram has varied from the memorial verses of the ancient Greeks, whether of death or memorable occurrences of any kind, that were actually *inscribed* (Greek 'epigram' equals Latin 'inscription') upon a monument, statue, or building, to similar verses that were not so inscribed, to verses tersely expressing almost any thought, to scurrilous or obscene poems of a few verses only, to brief poems of wit that culminate in a point which is usually satirical. And even beyond this wide range of content may be found many so-called epigrams. As for form, the hexameter and the elegiac distich were used in antiquity, but in modern times a variety of metrical patterns has obtained in each national literature. The only characteristics that appear common to the epigram in all ages are brevity and terseness. But can all brief, terse poems be called epigrams? And how brief must a poem be in order to lay claim to the title? It is not unusual to find epigrams of ten verses. But one would hardly assert that every terse poem of ten or less verses was an epigram. The triolet has eight lines and is often terse: it does not on that account fall under the head 'epigram.' What of the assertion that a madrigal is a non-satirical epigram? In view of the almost insurmountable difficulties of classification it is evident that attempts to define this kind or form must prove futile. "Nothing could be more hopeless," says the author of the article Epigram in the Encyclopaedia Britannica, "than an attempt to discover or devise a definition wide enough to include the vast multitude of little poems which at one time or other have been honored with the title of epigram, and precise enough to exclude all others." In including epigram under lyric, therefore, we do not mean to imply final classification; we merely, for convenience, follow a somewhat common but unjustified tradition.

In spite of the impossibility of definition the following questions may be suggested for consideration: (*a*) Is the epigram a distinct literary kind? Can such continuity of development be shown as to justify the wide use of the nomenclature? What, if any, characteristics, formal or psychological, are common to the so-called epigrams of all ages? (*b*) What is the relation of the epigram to the elegy? to the lyric? to narrative, descriptive, and reflective poetry? to "versified prose"? Consider F. E. Schelling's differentiation of the lyric and epigram, — the former as "emotional, poetic, and unconscious," the latter as "intellectual, rhetorical, and conscious" (The English Lyric, Chap. I); compare Henley's differentiation in the Introduction to his collection of English lyrics. (*c*) How many varieties of epigram may be detected (Scaliger, Herder)? (*d*) What function or functions has the epigram discharged? Is it social rather than individual in its scope and character? Does its brevity incline it to triviality? its pointed style to paltry personalities? To what extent has it attained the higher functions of art?

The student should examine the various attempts at definition and division of the epigram that have been made at different times. For this purpose he may consult the treatises upon poetics in general, elsewhere listed and described, of Minturno, Scaliger, Vossius (G. J. Voss), Boileau, Trapp, Batteux, Hegel, Vischer, Gottschall, Wackernagel, Scherer, etc. See § 3 below and Index. For the older monographs on the epigram, see the list given by Blankenburg-Sulzer (vol. III, pp. 171–172. Leipz.: 1798), or the condensed list under the article Epigram in the Encyclopaedia Britannica. R. Pechel's Geschichte der Theorie des Epigramms von Scaliger zu Wernicke (Introd. to Pechel's ed. of Wernicke's epigrams) is the fullest and best treatment of its kind; the principal theories of the epigram are discussed. The two most famous attempts toward a fundamental criticism are those of Lessing (Anmerkungen über das Epigramm und einige der vornehmsten Epigrammatisten) and Herder (Anmerkungen über die Anthologie der Griechen, besonders über das gr. Epigramm). For German critiques of these attempts see the 9th chapter of Baumgart's Handbuch der Poetik, and J. C. Brandelius' Diss. Theoriam Epigrammatis Percenses (a pamphlet of 14 pp., n.d.); cf. S. Piazza as noted below, § 5. For later English criticisms see J. A. Symonds' appreciative essay in his Studies of the Greek Poets and J. W. Mackail's introduction to his Select Epigrams from the Greek Anthology (London: 1890; revised 1906). They furnish scholarly and suggestive reviews of the Greek epigram. The Rev. James Davies has happily differentiated the Latin and Greek epigram in an essay in the *Quarterly Review* (vol. 117). The articles Epigram and Anthology in the Encyc. Britannica, and similar articles in the French and German encyclopaedias, are very helpful; of little worth, the introductory essays prefixed to the collections of epigrams by Richard Graves (Festoon, A Select Collection of Epigrams, Lond.: 1766), W. D. Adams (English Epigrams, Lond.: 1878), H. P. Dodd (The Epigrammatists, 2d ed. Lond.: 1875). Dodd mentions a "Critical Dissertation" prefixed to an anonymous (?) Collection of Epigrams (2 vols. Lond.: 1735–37). For other references, more properly grouped under the historical study of the epigram, see below, § 6, XXXIV, B, The Epigram.

I. *Vers de Société*, a special form of the epigram, offers an interesting field of study. In a highly organized state of society the conventions of social life are made the subject of clever, epigrammatic verse. See the verse and prefaces of Dobson; R. M. Alden's Introduction to Poetry (N.Y.: 1909), pp. 71–73; Locker-Lampson's

Lyra Elegantiarum (Preface); Carolyn Wells' A Vers de Société Anthology (Preface); and A. H. Miles' Poets and Poetry of the 19th Century, vol. IX. The subject extends over a wide range, from the present back to the eighteenth and seventeenth centuries, and still further back to Roman, Alexandrian, and Greek times. Does the vogue of this verse depend upon the social liberation of woman, and is it therefore of greater importance in modern than in ancient times?

J. Individual attention may be accorded to the *Dramatic Lyric* of Browning, — "though often lyric in expression, always dramatic in principle, and so many utterances of so many imaginary persons, not mine."

K. *Reflective Lyric.* Since reflection often seems the opposite pole of the passion that finds expression in the pure lyric, the mere nomenclature 'reflective lyric' reads like a contradiction in terms. But as a matter of fact emotion always implies the existence of a thought or image. The matter for present consideration, therefore, is not the admissibility of a reflective element but the extent to which it may color a lyric without destroying essential poetic emotionality. The reflective lyric may be said to emerge at the point where thought begins to dominate the utterance: in other words, where the direct appeal and aesthetic effect of the verse demand an immediate intellectual rather than emotional effort on the part of the reader. Yet even then the thought, if the poetry be genuine, is highly emotionalized, and is presented freely and intuitively, with reliance upon the ultimate persuasive effect of feeling, — not merely upon the pleasure arising from logical and dialectic processes (Carriere). Frequently the persuasive effect is of a higher degree of emotional satisfaction because of the intellectual effort through which it was attained. In its higher manifestations the reflective lyric may express an intuition of universality that is the catharsis or ideal assuagement of the poet's emotional fever, as in Wordsworth's two great odes, or George Eliot's "O May I Join the Choir Invisible" (see Vischer, Hegel).

The extreme of the reflective lyric is didactic poetry, to which many critics refuse the name of poetry, relegating it to a realm of "versified thought" (see Gayley and Scott, §§ 19, 20, especially pp. 292–293; also the article Didactic Poetry, by Gosse, in the Encyc. Brit.). The difference between didactic verse and reflective poetry has been stated thus: "The latter allows the poetic suggestion of the senses or imagination to lead the mind in certain channels (e.g. a dead leaf, our mortality). The didactic poem *forces* our poetic instincts, as well as suggestions of the senses, into certain channels of its own. But this is putting Pegasus to the plough" (Gummere, Poetics, pp. 51–52).

The student will naturally review the lyric forms which show most affinity to reflection, — the hymn, ode, elegy, epigram and proverb, riddle, sonnet, etc.; and he will consider to what extent epistolary, satiric, and descriptive poems may be regarded as lyrics of reflection. On the reflective character of the Oriental lyric see Vischer.

For further comment on the nature and varieties of the reflective lyric, Wackernagel, Carriere, Vischer, Hegel, Alden, and other writers upon poetics may be consulted. For the investigation of didactic poetry see the numerous critical and historical data furnished by Blankenburg-Sulzer (Article Lehrgedicht).

Examples of the reflective lyric are legion, but if the student needs a pointer the following may be suggested: Schiller's Ideal und Leben, Glück, Die Götter Griechenlands; many of Goethe's lyrics, Lamartine's Meditations, Sir H. Wotton's How Happy is he Born and Taught, Gray's Elegy, Milton's Lycidas, Wordsworth's Ode to Duty and Intimations, Tennyson's Higher Pantheism and In Memoriam, Browning's Abt Vogler, Arnold's Rugby Chapel and many other of his poems, and most of A. H. Clough's. See also, G. Meredith, R. Bridges, W. Watson, Francis Thompson.

V. **Classification of the Lyric.** The differentiation here will be, of course, by Kinds as determined by logical division. Later it should be by Stages of historical development.

A. *The Kinds.* 1. One must determine the most satisfactory ground or principle of logical division, and again of subdivision:

subject, purpose or occasion, mood, treatment, or form. 2. In considering each of the following more or less common classifications, it will be well to inquire whether the division is founded upon a single principle or basis, whether the constituent species (or kinds) are mutually exclusive, and whether, when added together, they exhaust the genus 'lyric': lyrics of love, nature, patriotism, grief, and other elementary subjects enumeratively rehearsed (as by Gummere, and in most treasuries of selections); courting lyrics, wedding lyrics, convivial, funereal, panegyrical, festival lyrics, etc.; lyrics of feeling, inspiration, reflection; of feeling, observation, contemplation; objective lyric of situation or persons, subjective lyric of intuition or will; simple, enthusiastic, reflective; epical-lyric (whence ode, hymn, and dithyramb), pure lyric, lyric of reflection, dramatic lyric; social and expository; spontaneous and cultivated; of the song type, of imaginative elaboration, of reflective and intellectual nature; absolute and relative; "lyrics in song stanzas, in the elegiac or heroic stanza, in various short stanzas, odes, sonnets, ballades, rondeaus, and so forth." See in general any of the German authors mentioned below (§ 2, References), but especially Werner, Hegel, Carriere, Vischer, Gottschall, Wackernagel, Viehoff, and Geiger; also Mill, Erskine, Schelling, Alden, Gummere, Saintsbury (Hist. Char. of the Eng. Lyric). 3. Classify the various lyrics of nature, the varieties of song, varieties of ode or elegy, etc. Compare above, IV, Special Forms. 4. Examine the classifications current in various national literatures, such as the medieval French or Provençal, the Italian, Greek, Indian, Persian, and Chinese. See below, § 6, under head of the lyrics of the respective nations.

B. *The Stages.* See below, §§ 4, 5, Historical Study of the Lyric, for folk lyric, art lyric; communal and personal lyric; symbolic, classic, romantic lyric (Hegel), etc.

VI. **Function of the Lyric.** The function of poetry as one of the fine arts may be regarded as aesthetic or ethical, or both; and in each case the question of function may be resolved into a consideration of Purpose and Effect.

A. *Aesthetic Function.* The discussion turns upon an understanding of the aesthetic emotions. That the student may familiarize himself with methods of defining and grading such emotions he should turn to the analyses and references, especially Hegel, Fechner, Helmholtz, Guyau, Sully, Marshall, Ladd, Allen, and Bosanquet, in Gayley and Scott, §§ 7–9; and to the later discussions by Karl Groos (The Play of Animals, London: 1898; Die Spiele der Menschen, Jena: 1899); Yrjö Hirn (The Origins of Art, London: 1900); William James (The Principles of Psychology, London: 1890); G. F. Stout (A Manual of Psychology, London: 1899); Wilhelm Wundt (Outlines of Psychology, 5th ed., Leipz.: 1907). He will also find an admirable sketch of the transition from bodily feelings, through concrete mental feelings, to the abstract mental feelings, or aesthetic emotions, and a theory of the grades of aesthetic emotions (the beautiful; the coenopathic — or social: tragic, comic, pathetic; and the sublime) in A. Weiss (Introduction to the Philosophy of Art, *Univ. Calif. Pubs. in Mod. Phil.*, Berkeley: 1910). He should, of course, read the portions of Aristotle's Poetics dealing with the tragic catharsis and Butcher's discussion in his Aristotle's Theory of Poetry and Fine Art (London: 1895). Since the present authors consider the problem carefully under the sections devoted to the nature and kinds of drama and the tragic catharsis in the succeeding volume of this work, they defer discussion at the present time. Abstract mental feelings are increasingly aesthetic as they tend toward ideal, social, unselfish pleasure or pleasure-pain. They are distinguished from those that centre in a personal desire to possess for physical or practical enjoyment, or to fly from that which inspires disgust or physical dread. The pleasure evoked by the beauty of the woodland or the sublimity of mountains and the pleasure-pain with which we follow the tragic career of a Brutus or an Oedipus are thoroughly impersonal and ideal — they may be shared with others and they grow in intensity with social communication; but the pleasure with which some may read a pornographic description and the aversion with which others may turn from it or from a gory accident are personal and sensual, or near akin to the sensual. The former emotions are aesthetic; the latter, not at all, or in a very low degree. For the gradation of the aesthetic emotions, various methods are proposed. The rationale of gradation is inherent, however, in the nature of the emotions. Since they are aesthetic in proportion as they affect us less and less physically — by recalling personal memories of the sensuous or by stimulating the imagination of possible sensuous experience — and as they affect us more and more socially and ideally (i.e. as having no counterparts in our individual sensuous life), it may be permissible to grade them as follows: (1) those that border upon physical and personal pleasure, aversion, or pain, recollected or imagined; (2) those that are more social in quality, but yet retain some spice of personal suggestion and stimulation, such as the romantic, comic, and sentimental emotions; (3) those that are entirely impersonal and social in interest and universal in significance and appeal, such as the tragic and the pathetic, and the comic when it has risen to the function of genial and remedial humor in the service of the social organism; (4) the religious emotion of the sublime, in which we are conscious of the presence of a superior — nay, an absolute — power, but do not feel that it imperils our personality; rather that the absolute lifts the individual self into harmony with it. As for the beautiful, see Weiss (Introd. to Phil. Art., pp. 291–296) for definition and discussion; also the works referred to above. In the process of conflict between sensuous and spiritual, individual and universal, which characterizes any aesthetic emotion, the beautiful may, perhaps, be regarded as one of those "resting points" when "a serene calm comes over us, and contentment and satisfaction occupy the mind. . . . Experiencing something beautiful, we find satisfaction in the feeling itself. We do not need to destroy it for the sake of satisfaction, and we do need to create physical conditions in order to sustain or enhance our feeling." The feeling-tone of our experience is capable of perpetuating itself with serene satisfaction; it may be "prolonged and enhanced even after the stimulus of the experience is removed." Or without any stimulation of an emotional conflict and its resolution, the satisfied feeling which we call the beautiful may find itself in peaceful contemplation occasioned by our consciousness of unity between objective appearance and subjective aspiration. But to crowd the consideration of the aesthetic emotions into a nutshell is a hopeless attempt and misleading in effect. The student, with study of such references as are given above, must examine and consider for himself.

He should next inquire with what Purpose the various forms of the lyric — e.g. the song, the ode, the hymn, the elegy, the reflective lyric — arouse these emotions and with what Effect they satisfy them. 1. Can the lyric be classified according to the different grades of aesthetic emotion, as here suggested, with which it functions? 2. Does the personal character of the modern lyric limit it to the less universal class of aesthetic emotions, or does individual expression pierce to the universal by its very intensity? What of the communal lyric? 3. Is it the *purpose* of the lyric to express the "desires, hopes, and fears" of which the poet is subjectively conscious, with such ideal fervor and scope that "lyric poetry tends to exalt the poet himself, to make his personality far more to us than the events which occasion his poem" (Gummere, Poetics, pp. 40–41)? 4. Is it the purpose of the more spontaneous lyric species to accomplish a discharge of immediate feeling under rhythmic conditions that at once heighten the feeling and satisfy, chasten, or purify it? What of the more reflective species? 5. Is, then, the *effect* of the lyric a catharsis of the emotions discharged, and also, perhaps, of the entire emotional-intellectual system? And is this catharsis merely medicinal in effect (purgative of the emotional causes), or does it embrace an idealization and universalizing of the emotion? Compare Butcher, Aristotle's Theory of Poetry and Fine Art, Chap. VI, The Function of Tragedy; A. C. Bradley, Oxford Lectures on Poetry, p. 37, The Sublime, p. 69, Hegel's Theory of Tragedy; and the same author's Shakesperean Tragedy (see Index, under 'Reconciliation'); compare, in our forthcoming volume on the

Drama, sections on Catharsis in Tragedy and Comedy. Is the lyric mood "the vibration between the peace of pure contemplation and the unrest of desire"? and, if so, does the aesthetic effect depend upon whether the desire of the poet is satisfied or restricted — upon whether he stop with the climax, the "cry" of regret or desire, or proceed to the serenity of attainment or resignation, to the recovery of balance? or may that recovery, that serenity, be implied without being confessed? (cf. Schopenhauer, Erskine). Is the lyric peculiarly romantic, personal, and intimate (J. S. Mill, Neilson)? and does not the character of the catharsis depend upon whether the romantic longing is for something real or something ideal — past, present, or future — and upon the degree in which the mood is dominated by imagination? Is the solution of the emotion in a mental attitude (Erskine)? Is this universalizing effect gained only in connection with the highest grade of aesthetic emotions? For the 'problem of the lyric,' see Lotze; for its purpose, Browning; for 'lyric catharsis,' Carriere, Erskine, Gummere, Geiger, Neilson, Woodberry (Appreciation of Lit.); and in general, the more philosophical of the works cited below, § 2. But the best method of answering these and similar questions is by direct induction from representative lyric anthologies, such as Palgrave's Golden Treasury, the Oxford anthologies of English and foreign verse, or such anthologies as are mentioned below, § 6, *passim*.

B. *Ethical Function*. The problem of ethical purpose and effect, invariably facing the critic of poetry, is complicated here by the subjective immediacy which characterizes the simplest and most spontaneous lyric forms. Does not this immediacy of passionate utterance suggest a function primarily and essentially psychological and aesthetic rather than ethical? To what extent has such utterance been unethical? Shall we not more readily find an aim to influence conduct, and an effect actually ethical, in the more reflective types of the lyric? As the purpose becomes consciously didactic do not the distinguishing traits of the lyric undergo an eclipse? Is the *tendenz-lyrik* to be regarded as, in any way, a form of pure lyric? See Geiger, pp. 21–24. On the general question of the relation of art to morals, see Gayley and Scott, Lit. Crit., §§ 7, 8. The references there indicated furnish generalizations from which the student may deduce the specific ethical problems worthy of consideration.

VII. **The Difference between the Lyric and Other Kinds of Poetry**, especially the epic and the drama, may be considered from the following points of view: the poet's subjectivity; the absoluteness or relativity of his vision; his attitude, — impressionistic, aesthetic, ideal, — unmoral, moral, religious; the nature of the objects contemplated and emotions aroused; the aim of the poet's representation and its effect (aesthetic and ethical); the movement or the unity appropriate to the poem and to the species of poetry; the material and the manner of the presentation; the audience appealed to. See Browning, Mill, Mure, Symonds, Hegel, Vischer, Carriere, Wackernagel, etc. Is the lyric concerned with a moment of time, the epic and drama with a revolution of time? See Geiger. Is the proper differentiation one between lyric poetry on the one hand and "pragmatic" (including epic and dramatic — as dealing with 'facts') on the other hand? See Geiger, Viehoff, Goethe, and compare Moulton, Mod. Study of Lit., pp. 44 ff., 197.

VIII. On the **Conditions of Society** that are most favorable to the production of the lyric, see Hegel, Courthope, Posnett. This consideration is introductory to the historical or comparative study of the lyric (see below, §§ 4–6), inasmuch as the lyric, though produced plentifully at all stages of development, varies according to tendencies in the different stages. Consider, for instance, the folk lyric as contrasted with the art lyric in successive periods. An epos, says Hegel, may represent a nation, but only a vast collection of lyrics can hope to achieve an equally representative character. It has been frequently remarked that among civilized peoples an age of intellectualism and strong social convention, as was the eighteenth century, is unfavorable to the growth of a strong lyric sentiment. The lyric may therefore be "the peculiarly romantic form of poetry, since it is, more directly than any other, the utterance of the personal and intimate mood of the individual soul" (W. A. Neilson, Essentials of Poetry, pp. 61 ff., 147 ff.). Does the poetry of to-day tend essentially to the lyric, and if so may we "look to the problem, in what sense lyric can be said to be the prevailing form at present, for some light on the larger problem of what we mean by the word" (Gould)?

SECTION 2. GENERAL REFERENCES

In studying what has been written about the nature of the different types of literature the student will often find himself compelled to consider anterior questions relative to the nature of art, literature, and poetry, because the definition of the kinds of poetry necessarily presupposes a definite conception of the larger classes to which they belong, and because often the best way of testing the validity of the theory of a genre is to determine whether or not the definition of poetry (or literature or art) that it premises is accurate and defensible. For analyses of these more general problems and for references bearing upon them, see Gayley and Scott, An Introduction to the Methods and Materials of Literary Criticism (Boston: 1899), Chap. II, Principles of Art, Chap. III, Principles of Literature, Chap. IV, The Theory of Poetry, Chap. VII, Principles of Versification; especially useful in the present connection are the sections on the theory of literature and poetry (§§ 13–15, 19–20).

It has not been thought necessary to repeat in the following bibliography references to works on versification which have already been given at length in §§ 23, 24 of the work just mentioned. Several important works on prosody have, however, appeared since the publication of those sections: these have been listed below. The student should not neglect to consult works on metric, for often he will find in them invaluable matter, both historical and theoretical. The treatises on the distinctive prosody of various national literatures are often rich in information. These remarks, moreover, apply more particularly to the study of the lyric, with its great variety of verse technique, than to any other type.

Alden, R. M. An Introduction to Poetry for Students of English Literature. N.Y.: 1909.

A very well-arranged and scholarly presentation of the principles of poetry in general, of the distinctive qualities of the major types and their variations, and of English metres, rhyme, and stanzaic forms. The value of the author's conclusions is enhanced by his indication of the readily available materials for inductive study and his quotation of the views of the principal authorities concerning the questions involved. For the lyric, see pp. 55–73.

Alexander, H. B. The English Lyric: A Study in Psychogenesis. In *University Studies*, *University of Nebraska*, IX, 4; Oct. 1909.

An attempt to read ethnic character — especially the English — in lyric expression.

Ambros, W. A. The Boundaries of Music and Poetry. Trans. from the German by J. H. Cornell. N.Y.: 1893.

Other references on the problem of the relations of music to poetry are: J. Combarieu, Les rapports de la musique et de la poésie (Paris: 1894); E. Gurney and L. Lanier, as noted below. See also the references given by Gayley and Scott, Lit. Crit., pp. 451–452, to Ruskin, Schmidt, Helmholtz, Weber, Schubart, Hauptmann, Bähr, etc.; a longer list of treatises on music may be found in Gayley and Scott's Guide to the Literature of Aesthetics (Berkeley: 1890), pp. 70–72. References on the origin of music will be found in Gayley and Scott, p. 181.

Aristotle. Poetics.

I, 2, 10; II, 4; IV, 7, 12–13; VI, 4, 7–8, 19; XII, 1–2; XVIII, 7.

The term 'lyric poetry' was not used by Aristotle. The Greeks generally used the term μέλη, in contradistinction to ἔπη and δράματα. Aristotle speaks of dithyrambic and gnomic poetry —

both lyrical modes, the one enthusiastic and Bacchic, the other quiet and earnest — but has nothing to say of them beyond assigning their places roughly in his scheme of imitation. Cf. J. A. Hartung (*op. cit.* § 8), pp. 3–6. Aristotle mentions also the Chorus as a part of drama, but without theorizing. For this silence regarding the lyric, see S. H. Butcher, Harvard Lectures on Greek Subjects (Boston: 1904), p. 198; and E. S. Bouchier, Aristotle's Poetics (Oxford: 1908), p. 1, Note. For the use by the Greeks of the terms 'melic,' 'lyric,' 'ode,' etc., see H. W. Smyth (*op. cit. infra*, § 5), pp. xvii ff., and E. D. Perry (*op. cit.* § 5). "It has long been a commonplace of Greek literary history that until late Alexandrian times the Greeks used no satisfactory comprehensive term for what has ever since then been styled 'lyric' poetry" (Perry, p. 62). The Greek term 'lyric' was first applied to poetry about 100 B.C., in the Ars Gramm. (p. 6, l. 10 Uhlig) of Dionysios Thrax, a pupil of Aristarchos, the Alexandrian.

BACON, FRANCIS. Works. Ed. by Spedding and others. 15 vols. N.Y.: 1869.

Vol. I, p. 517. De Augmentis, ii, 13.

Bacon's "classification of the lyric with philosophy and rhetoric explains the impersonal and imitative forms of lyric poetry at the end of the sixteenth century, and looks forward to the more complicated forms of the 'metaphysical school'; it is significant that his theory distinguishes verse of this sort from imaginative poetry, and equally significant that it recognizes no place for the lyric which reflects the inner life through the imagination" (Spingarn, J. E., Critical Essays of the 17th Century, I, xii–xiii).

BALDWIN, J. M. Thought and Things. 3 vols. Lond.: 1906–11.

The "Aesthetic Object" (object = psychic object) is defined as "an object of higher Semblance in which the dualism of inner and outer controls is annulled in a state of immediate contemplation." Is this definition especially applicable to the lyric "object"? (Cf. above, § 1, II, B, 1, (*g*).)

BATTEUX, CHARLES, ABBÉ. Les quatre poétiques, etc. 2 vols. Paris: 1771.

Vol. I, pp. 205–210, 227–239; Vol. II, Pt. iv, p. 75.

BATTEUX, CHARLES, ABBÉ. Einleitung in die schönen Wissenschaften, etc. Trans. by K. W. Ramler. 2d ed. 4 Bde. Leipz.: 1762–1763.

For the French original, see Principes de la littérature, 5th ed. 6 vols. Paris: 1774–1788, which contains the Cours de Belles-Lettres. Cf. Gummere, Poetics, pp. 41–42.

BAYNE, P. Two Great Englishwomen . . . with an Essay on Poetry. Lond.: 1881.

See Gayley and Scott, Lit. Crit., § 20.

BAYNE, T. *Fraser's Magazine*, N.S. 22: 627–639. Three Phases of Lyric Poetry.

A genial but not very profound discussion of the features of the verse of Gosse, Lang, and Hake, as representing respectively the sentimental, the artificial, and the philosophical phases of the lyric.

BEECHING, H. C. The Sonnets of Shakespeare. Boston: 1904.

Introduction.

BERNHARDY, G. Grundriss der griechischen Litteratur. Th. 2. Halle: 1845. 3–5 ed. 1877–92.

Th. 2, Abt. I Epos, Elegie, Iamben, Melik.

An exhaustive survey, critical and historical, of the various poetic genres of Greece so far as they were understood at the time this work was written. The arrangement by genres and the insertion of annotated bibliographies of critical and historical works under each division of each type combine to make this work a most valuable aid.

BERNHARDY, G. Grundriss der römischen Litteratur. 5th ed. 1872.

BIESE, A. Griechische Lyriker in Auswahl für den Schulgebrauch herausgegeben. 2 Pts. 2d ed. Leipz.: 1902–05.

The second part contains a very convenient introduction (pp. 1–30), theoretical and historical, to the study of the Greek lyric, including elegy and epigram.

BIESE, A. Das Metaphorische in der dichterischen Phantasie. In *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Litteraturgeschichte*, N. F. 2.

BIESE, A. Metaphorisch und Rhetorisch. Eine polemische Studie zu Aesthetik des lyrischen Liedes. *Id.*, Bd. 6.

These two essays, together with the criticism provoked by them, which is referred to by the author, are an important contribution to the theory of the lyric. Biese holds that the metaphor represents a primary, fundamental form of human thought. The essays should be read in their entirety for fruitful suggestions that cannot be detailed here. For other essays by Biese see below, § 3, VI, C.

BLAIR, H. Lectures on Rhetoric and Belles Lettres. 3 vols. Edinb.: 1813.

Vol. III, pp. 128–136.

BLANKENBURG, F. VON.

See below, under J. G. Sulzer. An old but very important bibliographical aid.

BÖCKEL, O. Psychologie der Volksdichtung. Leipz.: 1906.

The chapters on origin, nature, and development are too short to be satisfactory. Those on theory are readable, but not very profound or convincing. The larger part of the book is taken up with description of various features of folk song.

BOECKH, A. Encyclopädie und Methodologie der philologischen Wissenschaften.

See below, § 5.

BROWNING, R. On the Poet, Objective and Subjective . . . on Shelley as Man and Poet. 2d ed. (*Browning Soc. Papers*, Pt. I) Lond.: 1881.

Pp. 5–19; see also Gayley and Scott, Lit. Crit., § 20.

"The subjective poet is impelled to embody the thing that he receives, not with reference so much to the many below, as to the One above him." The following theses should be considered: (1) that the lyric poet seeks the primal elements of humanity in his own soul as the nearest reflex of the Absolute Mind; (2) that he is a seer rather than a fashioner; (3) his poetry an effluence rather than a work; (4) this effluence not to be judged apart from his personality; (5) that history shows us and always must show us a successive alternation of subjective and objective poets; (6) that the highest poet combines subjective and objective faculties of vision and creation.

BRUCHMANN, K. Poetik. Naturlehre der Dichtung. Berlin: 1898. Pp. 103–122; also, 58–64. See below, § 5.

Scientific in method; but the author is perhaps somewhat too cautious in drawing or suggesting conclusions.

BRUNETIÈRE, F. L'Évolution de la poésie lyrique en France au 19^e siècle. 2 vols. 2d ed. Paris: 1895.

An important work. The author defines the lyric as follows: "Lyric poetry is the expression of the personal feelings of the poet translated into rhythms analogous to the nature of his emotion" (vol. I, p. 154). Upon this passage Professor Beers writes (Points at Issue and Some Other Points, N.Y.: 1904, p. 184):

> The last clause may deserve our attention for a moment: "rhythms analogous to the nature of the emotion"; i.e. the verse is or should be flexible, sensitive in its response to the poet's changing moods. The critic goes on to declare that this conformity of the rhythmic movement to the emotion is in itself enough to make a poem truly lyrical, and that this "supple, ductile, and infinitely undulating character" of the verse is the musical element in lyric poetry, the part still subsisting in it of the song, the survival or the memory in it of its origin.

The second volume contains lectures on Vigny, T. Gautier, Hugo, The Renascence of Naturalism, Leconte de Lisle, Heredia, Sully-Prudhomme, Coppée, The Symbolists, The Future of Poetry, and Brunetière's own method of criticism.

Brunetière, F. L'Évolution littéraire de Victor Hugo. In *Rev. d. Deux Mondes*, 1902 (vol. VIII): 201–215.

Brunetière refutes Sainte-Beuve's observation on the anomaly of the mute character of the modern printed lyric by asserting the important doctrine of the *chant intérieur*. Cf. Erskine, p. 4.

Caine, T. Hall. Sonnets of Three Centuries. Lond.: 1882.

See the introduction; note the author's attempt to show that the English sonnet is an indigenous growth.

Carriere, M. Die Poesie. Ihr Wesen und ihre Formen. 2d ed. Leipz.: 1884. 1st ed. 1854.

Chap. VII Volks- und Kunstpoesie; chap. VIII, pp. 367–393 Die lyrische Darstellungsweise, pp. 393–407 Die lyrischen Dichtarten.

Carriere is an Hegelian, but his comparative method renders him less arbitrary than some of the philosophical critics. In Chap. VII, after explaining the rise of folk song from communal conditions, Carriere distinguishes between the folk lyric and the art lyric. Note especially p. 182: the folk song begins with an "appearance" or picture, and then continues with the emotion of the singer which has been symbolized or suggested in the picture; but the art lyric begins with the direct expression of the feeling and then adds picture and incident, thus reversing the former process. Cf. Woodberry, Appreciation of Literature, pp. 41–46. In Chap. VIII Carriere descants upon the richness and force of lyric subjectivity, and discusses the lyric catharsis which lies in the mere act of harmonizing in verse the cries of the soul.

The lyric poet's relation to the period in which he writes is thus stated:

> Der Lyriker steht in der Gegenwart und verewigt den Augenblick, indem er ausspricht welch werthvoller Empfindungsgehalt in demselben liegt, und wenn er in die Vergangenheit zurück oder in die Zukunft vorausschaut, so gelten beide nicht um ihrer selbst willen, sondern nur durch die Bedeutung welche sie für den gegenwärtigen Moment haben (p. 373).

Is the past only a symbol in the lyric mood? — In the third reference, above, the lyric is divided into lyrics "des Gefühls, der Anschauung, des Gedankens." — Cf. the same author's Aesthetik (2 vols. Leipz.: 1885), vol. II, pp. 567–579; and his Die Kunst im Zuzammenhang der Kulturentwickelung (5 vols. Leipz.: 1871–73), vol. I, pp. 533–547 Spruchdichtung und Kunstlyrik; vol. III, pt. 1, pp. 281–307 Die Lyrik und Gedankendichtung. Cf. references to Carriere in Gayley and Scott, Index.

COLERIDGE, S. T.

See below, § 3, V, D.

COURTHOPE, W. J. Life in Poetry: Law in Taste. Lond.: 1901.
Pt. III, Lecture IX.

The lyric is regarded as the expression of that self-consciousness which develops with the advance of civilization; in late times poetry passes somewhat from the imitation of the universal in nature to the imitation of self-consciousness in the soul of the individual. Hence Macaulay's famous dictum concerning the decline of poetry (see Gayley and Scott, §§ 17, 20) is amended to read: "that when society reaches the stage at which self-consciousness is widely diffused, the epic, dramatic, and it may be added the didactic, forms of poetry decline, and where poetry survives as an art, men mainly seek to express their ideas of Nature in the lyric form (389–390)." The recent success of Rostand, Hauptmann, and others in poetic drama may lead one to question the amendment as well as the dictum.

In studying the self-conscious lyric one should notice "the indirect influence of society in imposing its own limitations and character on the ideas of the individual poet, and next the nature of the ideal form in which the poet attempts to give the appearance of universality to his own self-consciousness" (391). The rest of the lecture traces the rise of self-consciousness in European literature from Rousseau and the natural reaction against eighteenth-century conformity, and enlarges upon Byron and

Tennyson as typical respectively of those political and personal aspects of the movement that were especially noticeable in England. On Courthope, cf. Gayley and Scott, p. 307, and Index.

CROISET, A. La poésie de Pindare et les lois du lyrisme grec. Paris: 1880.

The first part of this work furnishes an admirable introduction to the theory of the Greek lyric in general.

DENNIS, J. Studies in English Literature. Lond.: 1876.

See the essays, English Lyrical Poetry, The English Sonnet.

These essays, in purpose both critical and historical, display the characteristic attitude of the nineteenth century toward the lyric. "We have learnt, however, of late years what was not so well understood a century ago, that the critic's office is to follow the poet, not to require that the poet should follow him. . . . Of the lyric poet especially it may be safely asserted that the lack of conventional restraint, the freedom to sing his own song to his own music, is essential to success" (English Lyrical Poetry, p. 289).

DE QUINCEY, THOMAS. Wordsworth's Poetry. In *Tait's Magazine*, 1845.

In his brief critical utterances De Quincey often displays a fineness and subtlety of psychological observation revelatory of the manner in which the analysis of a poet's ideas and emotions may be conducted. In this essay occurs a penetrative suggestion as to lyrical emotion and diction:

> Lyrical emotion of every kind, which (to merit the name *lyrical*) must be in the state of flux and reflux, or, generally, of agitation, also requires the Saxon element of our language. . . . And, universally, this may be remarked — that, wherever the passion of a poem is of that sort which *uses*, *presumes*, or *postulates* the ideas, without seeking to extend them, Saxon will be the 'cocoon' . . . which the poem spins for itself. But, on the other hand, where the motion of the feeling is *by* and *through* the ideas, where (as in religious or meditative poetry — Young's, for instance, or Cowper's) the sentiment creeps and kindles underneath the very tissues of thinking, there the Latin will predominate.

In the two following paragraphs is a very clear and just criticism of Wordsworth's theory of poetic diction. As an example of acute observation of poetic habits note the following:

> But whosoever looks searchingly into the characteristic genius of Wordsworth will see that he does not willingly deal with a passion in its direct aspect, or presenting an unmodified contour, but in forms more complex and oblique, and when passing under the shadow of some secondary passion.

See the examples cited and compare Wordsworth's saying that poetry deals with remembered emotions. De Quincey's remark is suggestive of a very important method of studying the lyrical content.

DILTHEY, W. Das Erlebnis und die Dichtung. Leipz.: 1906. 4th ed. 1913.

Goethe und die dichterische Phantasie.

A large part of the theory of the lyric is concerned with the essential character of the poetic imagination. This essay casts light on the general problem. It does not treat of the lyric in particular.

DRINKWATER, J. The Lyric. Lond.: n.d.–1917.

A brief essay on the theme that lyric and poetry are synonymous terms.

DU PREL, C. Psychologie der Lyrik. Leipz.: 1880.

The author's method consists in showing that lyric poetry, dreams, and the *Weltanschauung* of primitive man all depend, psychologically, upon a certain involuntary imagination. By the comparison of these three results of one mental condition considerable light is thrown on the nature of the lyric.

EGGER, É. Essai sur l'histoire de la critique chez les Grecs. 2d ed. Paris: 1886.

A delightful and valuable introduction to the Greek aesthetics of literature. This work and the first volume of Professor

Saintsbury's Hist. of Criticism should be in the hands of every student who contemplates a study of Greek and Hellenistic contributions to the theory of the poetic types.

ENGEL, J. J. Schriften. 14 Bde. Berlin: 1844–1845.

Vol. XI Anfangsgründe einer Theorie der Dichtungsarten aus deutschen Mustern entwickelt. Pp. 230–277 Von dem lyrischen Gedicht. See also Schriften, 1806, vol. XI, p. 25 ff.

Engel's essay is based upon a wide induction — many poems are quoted — and it deserves more notice than is usually bestowed upon it. The author believed he had discovered the essential law underlying the spontaneous, dithyrambic utterance of the lyric. This law he held to be the association of images and ideas by the imagination alone, independent of any control by real objects in the external world such as is always a curbing force in pragmatic and descriptive poetry (compare M. Mendelssohn, *op. cit. infra.*, vol. IV, pt. II, p. 431, on the Ordnung der begeisterten Einbildungskraft as giving the underlying law of the lyric). The lyric speaker, or speakers, as in lyric dialogue, must be entirely under the dominance of one emotion; otherwise, a conversation, characterized by imaginative sally and progress, would be a lyric. "... das Wesen jedes lyrischen Gedichts überhaupt Phantasiegang einer Seele ist, die sich ganz dem Eindruck eines Gegenstandes hingiebt ..." (p. 260). The posing and answering of the two following questions are of importance: (1) "Denn wie, wenn es Stücke gäbe, in denen zwar sichtbar der Phantasiegang herrschte, die man aber darum nicht lyrisch nennen könnte"? (2) "Wie, wenn es andere Stücke gäbe, in denen man jenen Gang nicht fände, und die doch, nach aller Geständniss, lyrisch wären" (p. 237)? Various characteristics of the lyric are discussed on pp. 247–256; the ode, song, and elegy are differentiated, pp. 257–262; cf. pp. 16–19. Engel derived his ideas upon the lyric in part from M. Mendelssohn. The student should compare Engel's law of the lyric with the theories of Baldwin, Erskine, and Geiger, as noted above and below.

Erskine, J. The Elizabethan Lyric. A Study. N.Y.: 1903.

Chap. I Lyrical Quality and Lyric Form.

Two uses of 'lyrical' as a term of quality are noted: the earlier use "had in mind the musical accompaniment that the word suggests; the modern habit finds the characteristic note in subjective expression" (p. 9). Lyric form, understood as referring not to the stanza but to the internal structure, requires "first, the unity of emotion resulting from the lyric stimulus, and secondly, the formative effect of the stimulus upon the development of the emotion" (p. 15). In general the lyric procedure is described as threefold: first, reproduction of the cause or stimulus of the emotion; second, development of the emotion; third, the solution of the emotion in a thought or mental attitude.

Farnell, G. S. Greek Lyric Poetry.

See below, § 5.

Flach, H. Geschichte der griechischen Lyrik.

See below, § 5.

Fuller, H. de W. Lyric Poetry. In *The Nation*, vol. 98, pp. 232-235. N.Y.: 1914.

The inadequacy of the musical and subjective tests as differencing qualities of the lyric is considered with reference to the definitions proposed by Reed, Schelling, and Rhys. After suggesting certain other characteristics, only to show that they are not peculiar to the lyric, the writer concludes that "the lyric, except in Palgrave's practical use of the term, means little more than a poetic quality. It comes close to signifying what is conveyed by the vague phrase 'pure poetry.'" This idea, the student should note, had already been expressed by Jouffroy (1843), J. S. Mill, and Gosse (Encyc. Brit.), and is, moreover, suggested by the vague commonplace of lyric criticism to the effect that the lyric is the most 'purely' poetic of the genres. For further discussion of this suggestion, see above, § 1, 1, Definitions of the Lyric.

GAYLEY, C. M. The Principles of Poetry. In Gayley and Young's English Poetry, its Principles and Progress. N. Y.: 1904.

> Pp. lxxix–xcii, a condensed account of the larger units of verse — stanzaic and structural forms — and of the choral beginnings of poetry; xcvii ff., the Poetry of Song: Choral, Lyric.

"The choral song was the unpremeditated outburst of communal emotion. Its daughter far removed, the lyric of conscious art, is the product of individual feeling worked over in moments of tranquillity. In many cases the modern lyric poet seems to be singing to himself. . . . [The lyric of art is the literary] expression of personal emotion in 'singable' or, at any rate, tuneful form. . . . The artistic lyric inclines to be somewhat restrained and thoughtful; indeed on that account some of our noblest odes, Wordsworth's on Immortality and Duty, Dryden's, Tennyson's, and Lowell's, as well as elegies such as the Lycidas, though they speak a personal emotion, have been classed frequently among reflective poems. But they are merely the lyric of a self-repressive age. The lyric does not tell a story, it presents or suggests the atmosphere of a story at some crisis of its career: and the career is of the poet's mood" (pp. xcvii–xcviii).

GAYLEY, C. M., and SCOTT, F. N. An Introduction to the Methods and Materials of Literary Criticism. The Bases in Aesthetics and Poetics. Boston: 1899.

> Cited throughout the present work as Gayley and Scott, Lit. Crit., or simply as Gayley and Scott.

A systematic statement of problems, theoretical and historical, relating to the Nature and Function of Literary Criticism (Chap. I), Principles of Art (Chap. II), Principles of Literature (Chap. III), Theory of Poetry (Chap. IV), Historical Study of Poetry and Poetics (Chaps. V, VI), and Principles of Versification (Chap. VII). These subjects are subdivided and analyzed in detail, and annotated bibliographies are added to the several sections. As already suggested (see above, p. 41) the student of literary types should frequently refer to the more general problems of art, literature, poetry, and criticism mapped out in this book. Dealing as it does with critical and aesthetic bases, the book was written as an introduction to the study of literary types attempted in the present volume and that which will follow.

GEIGER, E. Beiträge zu einer Aesthetik der Lyrik. Halle: 1905.

Werner's work (see below) is adversely criticised for its fallacious assumption of a similarity in the evolution of nature and of art, for putting forward a too mechanical and objective account of lyric development, and laying too great emphasis upon content and experience, and for slighting the importance of the creative, form-giving function of the individual artist (pp. v–x). — Poetry, as one of the arts, handles nature through feeling; and the lyric is distinguished from drama and epos by its selection of the feeling of a particular moment, whereas the other two sorts deal with a revolution of time and the emotions appropriate thereto (compare Goethe and Schiller on *Pragmatik*). The body of the essay contains a thorough psychological analysis of the lyric in its various stages of progression from conception to expression; it lays particular emphasis on the creative act of the poet that intervenes between experience and expression and regards the latter as something more than a reflex of the former. The student should read the work carefully, bearing in mind, however, the need of a fuller differentiation of the lyrical processes from those of epic and drama than is afforded by Geiger. An important contribution. Compare Baldwin, Engel, Erskine, Jacobowski, Werner, etc.

GINER, F. Estudios de Literatura y Arte. Madrid: 1876.

Pp. 47–64 Del Género de Poesía mas Propio de nuestro Siglo (the lyric).

GLEDITSCH, H. Metrik der Griechen und Römer.

See Gayley and Scott, § 23. A third edition (München: 1901) of this valuable work has appeared.

Gosse, E. Elegy. In Encyclopaedia Britannica. 11th ed. Vol. IX, pp. 252–353.

A very brief notice of the elegy, critical and historical.

Gosse, E. Lyrical Poetry. In Encyclopaedia Britannica. 11th ed. Vol. XVII, pp. 180–181.

Lyric is defined as "a general term for all poetry which is, or can be supposed to be, susceptible of being sung to the accompaniment of a musical instrument." Subjective content (cf. Hegel and others) is an insufficient differentia. The relations of epic and of ancient and modern drama, of elegy and of sonnet, to this singable character are discussed, and it is pointed out that a perfect modern lyric finds its musical accompaniment in complexity of rhythmical and stanzaic form. But, after all, says the author, agreeing with Jouffroy, lyric is merely another name for the essence of poetry. "It includes all the personal and enthusiastic part of what lives and breathes in the art of verse, so that the divisions of pedantic criticism are of no real avail to us in its consideration. We recognize a narrative or epical poetry; we recognize drama; in both of these, when the individual inspiration is strong, there is much that trembles on the verge of the lyrical. But outside what is pure epic and pure drama, all, or almost all [excepting descriptive and didactic poetry], is lyrical."

Gottschall, R. Poetik. Die Dichtkunst und ihre Technik. 2 vols. 3d ed. Breslau: 1873.

Vol. II, pp. 4–96.

Gottschall's classification is as follows: Lyrik der Empfindung (Lied); Lyrik der Begeisterung (Ode); Lyrik der Reflexion (Elegie). The discussion cannot be said to be particularly illuminating; but see Gayley and Scott, pp. 426–427, and compare under Viehoff, below.

Gould, G. An Essay on the Nature of Lyric. Illustrated from the History of English Poetry. Quain Prize Essay, University College, London. Lond.: 1909.

A somewhat headlong, unparagraphed prize-essay, with not a little 'fine writing'; but suggestive and stimulating. Spontaneity of effect, rather than of creation, is the essential quality both of the lyric in particular and of art in general, says the writer, and he proceeds to elaborate the well-known conception that the lyric is the essential type of poetry. "In fine, the lyric is the only kind whose length and nature admit of the essentially poetical effect of suddenness being maintained throughout, and all the elements of its effect being comprised in an immediate view." General remarks upon the nature of poetry — that it is "splendid, single, and wonderful" — are then loosely applied to the lyric and illustrated by the history of English lyrism.

Gray, T. Works in Prose and Verse. Ed. by E. Gosse. 4 vols. Lond.: 1884.

Vol. II, pp. 304–305 Letters to William Mason; see also below, § 3.

On the difference between lyric and epic styles; the lyric superior to every other style.

Groos, K. and I. Netto. Psychologisch-statistische Untersuchungen über die visuellen Sinneseindrücke in Shakespeares lyrischen und epischen Dichtungen. In *Englische Studien*, 43: 27. 1910.

Gruppe, O. F. Die römische Elegie.

See below, § 5.

Guest, E. A History of English Rhythms. 2 vols. London: 1838. A new edition by W. W. Skeat. London: 1882.

See Gayley and Scott, § 23.

Gummere, F. B. Handbook of Poetics. 3d ed. Boston: 1898.

Pp. 40–57.

Gummere regards the lyric as of later growth than the epic. This conclusion should not be accepted without examination. His criterion for the value of lyric poetry and the suggestion (p. 42) of a "Lyric Catharsis" are worthy of development. Gummere uses a twofold basis of classification: (1) the nature or quality of the emotion aroused; (2) the occasion or object of the emotion. See also other works by same author, as noted below, §§ 5, 11.

GURNEY, E. The Power of Sound. Lond.: 1880.

Also by the same author, Tertium Quid, 2 vols., Lond.: 1887.

For these valuable and delightful works, from which may be gleaned suggestions bearing upon many problems of the lyric, see the estimates given by Gayley and Scott, pp. 100, 318, 319, 468.

HARTMANN, E. VON. Ausgewählte Werke. 2d ed. Leipz.: n.d.

Bd. IV, Zweiter systemat. Theil der Aesthetik, pp. 732–744.

A very clever treatment of the lyric as the expression of poetic subjectivity. Note the classification: epical lyric, pure lyric, dramatic lyric. Consider especially the discussion of the pure lyric.

HARTMANN, E. VON. Philosophy of the Unconscious. Trans. by W. C. Coupland. Lond.: 1884.

Pp. 269–292.

The general discussion of the part played by the Unconscious in aesthetic creation admits of ready and suggestive application to lyrical inspiration.

HEBBEL, F. Sämmtliche Werke. 26 vols. Ed. by R. M. Werner. Berlin: 1900 +.

The quickest way of coming upon Hebbel's scattered, aphoristic remarks upon the lyric is through the index to his Dramaturgie (ed. by W. von Scholz, München und Leipz.: 1907). Many suggestive hints may be mined from the Tagebücher.

HEGEL, G. W. F. Vorlesungen über die Aesthetik. Werke. 18 vols. Berlin: 1833–1848.

Bd. X, Abt. III, pp. 419–466 Die Lyrische Poesie.

A profound and vital treatment of the subject. The topics of discussion are as follows: pp. 419–420 The inner intuition and experience afforded by the lyric; 421–441 The general character of the lyric — (1) its content, (2) its form, (3) the stages of consciousness and of culture necessary to produce the lyric; 441–466 Special aspects of lyric poetry — (1) the lyric poet, (2) the lyric masterpiece, its unity, evolution, and external technique, (3) the several kinds of lyric — hymns, odes, miscellaneous, such as folk songs, sonnets, sestinas, elegies, epistles. For translations, see W. Hastie's Hegel and Michelet's Philosophy of Art (Edinb.: 1886), Pt. III, Poetic Art, § 11, pp. 94–100, Lyric Poetry; also, Kedney's Hegel's Aesthetics, pp. 282–286, and C. Bénard's La Poétique par G. W. F. Hegel (Paris: 1855). — For a highly technical philosophical view of the religious hymn, see Hegel's Die Phänomenologie dės Geistes (1807), — English trans. by F. B. Baillie (2 vols. Lond.: 1910), vol. II, p. 717 ff. For Hegel's System of Aesthetics, see references in Gayley and Scott, Index.

HEPPLE, N. Lyrical Forms in English. Edited, with introduction and notes, for the use of schools, etc. Cambridge: 1911.

See Introduction: History and Characteristics of the English Lyric; also brief notes on the characteristics of Song, Sonnet, Ode, Idyl, and Elegy.

HERDER, J. G. VON. The Spirit of Hebrew Poetry. Trans. by James Marsh. 2 vols. Burlington: 1833. For the German original, see Herder's Werke, ed. B. Suphan, 32 vols., Berlin: 1877–1899, vols. XI, XII.

Vol. II, pp. 22–26. A brief characterization of the Song as the second species of Hebrew poetic art; it is held that form, not content, determines the literary kind; pp. 192–199 Music and Dancing United in the Composition of National Songs; pp. 222–304 Discussion of the Psalms. See also both vols. *passim* for interpretation of Hebrew lyrics. On the significance of Herder's work see the reference in § 11, below.

HERDER, J. G. VON. Volkslieder. 2 Pts. Leipz.: 1778–1779.

Later gathered by J. Müller under the title Stimmen der Völker in Liedern, 1807. Also to be found in vol. XXV of Suphan's ed. of the Sämmtliche Werke.

Herder published his translation of folk songs thirteen years after the appearance of Percy's Reliques (1765), by which it was probably suggested. He thus aided the German eighteenth-century revolt against pseudo-classical frigidity, and did for Germany what Percy did for England. He prepared the way for the ballads of Bürger, Goethe, Schiller, and Uhland. — Prefaced to the first part of the work are several *loci classici* (from Montaigne, Sidney, Addison, etc.) of early recognition of the value of popular poetry. In the Introduction to the second part is a very brief sketch of the sources of popular poetry among ancients and moderns. For further references, see Herder's letters and reviews; see also below, § 11.

HILLEBRAND, J.

See below, § 8.

HUDSON, W. H. An Introduction to the Study of Literature. 2d ed. Lond.: 1913.

Pp. 126–134 Subjective Poetry.

A brief, practical introduction to the lyric and its principal varieties, including ode and elegy.

HUNT, L., and LEE, S. A. The Book of the Sonnet. Boston: 1867.

Introduction: The Sonnet: its Origin, Structure, and Place in Poetry.

JACOBOWSKI, L. Die Physik der Lyrik. Ein Beitrag zu einer realistischen Poetik.

This is an introduction to the author's Die Anfänge der Poesie, for which see Gayley and Scott, § 17, and below, § 11.

JEVONS, F. B. A History of Greek Literature.

See below, § 5.

JOËL, K. Der Ursprung der Naturphilosophie aus dem Geiste der Mystik. Basel: 1903.

Pp. 23–70.

The essay raises the suggestive question of the relation between lyrical and mystical enthusiasms. It is held that the pre-Socratic philosophy of nature, by reason of its subjective and emotional, or mystical, view of the world, was lyrical in character.

JOHNSON, C. F. Forms of English Poetry. N.Y.: 1904.
Pp. 107–324, especially 230–231.

A book for beginners, covering briefly both theory and history.

JOUFFROY, T. S. Cours d'Esthétique. 1843. 3d ed. 1875.

Gosse (see above) points out that Jouffroy was the first to advance the opinion that lyric is only another name for the essence of poetry. It is to be feared that Jouffroy's attendance at the Scottish shrine of "common sense" (Stewart and Reid) rendered him somewhat superficial in his easy dismissal of the lyric. Discussion above, § 1, 1, Definitions of the Lyric.

KALUZA, M. A Short History of English Versification. English trans. by A. C. Dunstan. Lond.: 1911.

A convenient, brief compilation for the student who is not ready to use the mass of materials in Schipper's Englische Metrik or Saintsbury's Hist. of English Prosody. The sections on lyrical stanzas are especially helpful to the student who is seeking definitions and examples of lyrical patterns. See especially §§ 226–250, where are given brief lists of modern English examples of the following stanzas: rhymed couplets and triplets, poulter's measure, common metre, elegiac stanza, In Memoriam stanza, Burns' stanza, Venus and Adonis, Chaucerian, Spenserian, Epithalamium stanzas, regular and irregular Pindaric odes, stanzas without rhyme, sonnet, imitations of Italian and French stanzas, etc.

KEBLE, J. Praelectiones Academicae. Oxford: 1844. English trans., Keble's Lectures on Poetry, by E. K. Francis, 2 vols., Oxford.: 1912.
Lects. XXIV–XXVII Lyric Poetry and Pindar.

"Assuredly they (lyric poets) all have this note common, that they are trying to express the seething feelings of the soul by means of rhythmical language, drawing their inspiration from the circumstances of the moment, and not like Epic and Tragic or 'Didactic' poets, always carrying in their mind the scheme of a poem already outlined long ago" (vol. II, p. 93, of the English trans.). For an appreciation of Keble as a critic see Saintsbury, Hist. Crit.

Kedney, J. S. Hegel's Aesthetics. A Critical Exposition. Chicago: 1897.

Pp. 282–286.

The poet draws to himself all and sends it forth subjectified; but the utterances must be the result of poetic outlook. Power is from the poetic soul. Lyric subjects are numberless and unlimited by time or place. By the charm of expression the lyric can give life and interest to almost anything. It may be founded on epic event, since the poet seeks to arouse in the auditor his own sentiment. Epigram is lyric in so far as it expresses personal sentiment. Lyric treatment shows in romance — as the writer puts himself into the characterization. He may marry the thinnest thought or most vagrant feeling to subtle and mysterious sound, as did Shakespeare and Poe. Refinements of emotion produce lyrics of national, cultured, and fashionable life. In the popular and national lyric, as in epic, the poet effaces self and expresses common sentiment. There may be philosophical lyrics. The popular lyric precedes prose. The artistic lyric follows it. The artist must be cultivated, and have skill in execution. Art supposes that the artist knows and wills what he is to produce. The lyric must have (1) unity, — the same emotional and poetic attitude must be maintained, otherwise the result will be didactic; (2) swift movement, — but it may introduce episodes which glide, like the restful passages in music, out of the essential melody and return to it. The lyric may have any kind of verse-form, though the hexameter and blank verse are not favorable. Rhyme is an assistance. Hymns, dithyrambs, paeans, psalms, odes, are lyrics. Song is the fittest poetic utterance. It may proceed from any objective or subjective change. Its proper characters are naïveté, involuntariness, and simplicity of utterance. In song the poet may indulge his abandon. Sonnet and elegy are more restrained. Lyric poetry displays better than anything else national contemporary peculiarities and those of the individual genius. Lyrics are divisible into symbolic, classic, and romantic. The lyric of the Occident is more subjective than that of the Orient; the Roman more so than the Greek. In the classic lyric the inner sentiment is expressed not with symbolic vagueness but with clearness and precision. On Kedney see Gayley and Scott, § 8.

KLEINPAUL, E. Poetik. 3 Pts. Leipz.: 1879–1880.
Pt. III, pp. 29–104 Lyrische Poesie.

The essay as a whole rather lacks logical treatment; many sorts of lyric are enumerated and commented upon without any thoroughgoing principle of division.

LANGE, K. Das Wesen der Kunst. Grundzüge einer illusionistischen Kunstlehre. 2d ed. Berlin: 1907.

When Professor Lange attempts to extend to music and the lyric his theory of illusion as the basic function of the arts, many interesting questions arise. Is there any illusion involved in the lyric expression of feeling (pp. 103, 208–215)? Is the lyric 'imitative' of the invisible (104)? Is onomatopoetic illusion characteristic of the lyric (109)? In the sound-illusion of the arts (*Geräuschillusion*) does the aesthetic effect stand in inverse ratio to the exactness of the imitation (109)? Does not the lyric poet's idealization of his emotions produce an illusion, both for himself and for his audience (209)? Can lyrics of practical purpose, such as war-lyrics, religious lyrics, or political lyrics, which aim to arouse the emotions for a particular use, be included under the art-lyric; and do they possess the same elements of illusion (209 ff.)? Can it be said of lyric creation that "das Künstlerische Schaffen setzt eine gewisse Gefühlsfreiheit, ein Stehen über dem Gefühl voraus" (211)? See also, for further statements calling for discussion, pp. 520, 605, 618, 622, 655.

LANIER, S. Music and Poetry. N.Y.: 1898.

Cf. W. A. Ambros, above.

LANIER, S. The Science of English Verse. N.Y.: 1880.

LEWIS, C. M. The Principles of English Verse. N.Y.: 1906.

LLOYD, M. Elegies: Ancient and Modern.

See below, § 5.

LOCKER-LAMPSON, F. Lyra Elegantiarum. Lond.: 1867. Rev. ed. Lond.: 1891.

To this admirable collection of English *vers de société* is prefixed "a discussion of the nature and essential qualities of familiar verse, which remains to this day the most suggestive and enlightening essay on the subject" (Swinburne, Social Verse, in Studies in Prose and Poetry. N.Y.: 1894). Locker-Lampson describes the type thus: "smoothly written verse, where a boudoir decorum is, or ought always to be, preserved; where sentiment never surges into passion, where humour never overflows into boisterous merriment." "Qualities of brevity and buoyancy are absolutely essential."

LOTZE, H. Outlines of Aesthetics. Trans. by G. T. Ladd. Boston: 1886.

Pp. 99–102.

The lyric a movement of fancy by which the spirit strives to lift itself from the limited to the universal . . . an effort to express the material of passion in terms of real existence, etc. It is somewhat doubtful whether the definitions on p. 100 exclude other kinds of poetry, and whether the two kinds of lyric (p. 101) are correctly denominated social and expository. There is admirable force in Lotze's statement of the "problem of the lyric"; but does not the drama open to the individual mood a similar perspective? Note the argument for spontaneity and occasionality of form.

MACKAIL, J. W. Lectures on Greek Poetry. Lond.: 1910.
Pp. 83–138 The Lyric Poets.

Professor Mackail happily classifies the lyric, according to the degree of inspiration involved, as the lyric that arises out of an emotion compelling lyrical expression; the lyric that arises out of a real emotion powerful only to suggest, not to compel, expression; the lyric in which the emotion is second-hand, "the emotion of literature as it may be called rather than the emotion of life"; and the false lyric, "not born of emotion at all, but the dexterous machine-made product of simulated emotion" (pp. 98–99).

MACKAIL, J. W. Lectures on Poetry. Lond.: 1911.
See below, § 5.

MACKAIL, J. W. Select Epigrams from the Greek Anthology. Lond.: 1890.

The introduction gives a most admirable and charming account, historical and appreciative, of the Greek Anthology. For other references on the epigram, see above, § 1, IV, H, and below, § 6, XXXIV, B.

MAHAFFY, J. P. History of Classical Literature.
See below, § 5.

MARTINON, PH. Les strophes, etc.
See below, § 5.

MASQUERAY, P. Théorie des formes lyriques de la tragédie grecque. Paris: 1895.

Valuable to the student of the Greek lyric.

MENDELSSOHN, M. Gesammelte Schriften. 7 Bde. Leipz.: 1843–1845.

Bd. IV, Abt. I, p. 28 ff. Von der lyrischen Poesie; Bd. IV, Abt. II, p. 431 ff. Rezension von Karschin; *ibid.*, p. 537 ff. Rezension von Ramler; cf. Braitmaier (*op. cit.* § 8), Pt. II, pp. 226–233. See also L. Goldstein, M. Mendelssohn und die deutsche Aesthetik (in *Teutonia*, No. 3. 1904).

Mendelssohn held that lyric ecstasy is incompatible with abstract ideas of physical causation and natural law; that it demands instead a world completely and concretely animated, or at least controlled by animated Beings. For this reason he desiderated mythology as a proper and necessary subject for the lyric, much as Boileau (A. P. III, 160 ff.) had supported it for the epic. But does not the lyric ecstasy create its own mythology by the personifying force of an intense realization of its material, and should it then be limited for subjects to a commonly received mythology? Mendelssohn's attempt at discovering the psychological basis of the lyric is, in spite of its antiquated terminology, worth serious attention. See Braitmaier for a careful summary, and compare J. J. Engel, cited above, for the working out of Mendelssohn's essay, Von der Lyrischen Poesie.

Miessner, W. Ludwig Tiecks Lyrik. In *Litthist. Forschungen*, No. 24. 1902.

A study of motivation, construction, etc.

Mill, J. S. Dissertations and Discussions. 5 vols. N.Y.: 1874–1875.

Vol. I, pp. 89–120 Thoughts on Poetry and its Varieties.

A masterly criticism of Shelley and Wordsworth as exponents respectively of the spontaneous and 'cultivated' schools of poetry. The distinctions between the unity of contemplation and the unity of feeling, between logical sequence and emotional association of ideas, throw light on the nature of the lyric. See also Gayley and Scott, § 20, p. 332.

Moormann, F. W. Interpretations of Nature in English Poetry from Beowulf to Shakespeare. In *Quellen und Forsch.*, No. 95. 1905.

Moulton, R. G. The Modern Study of Literature. An Introduction to Literary Theory and Interpretation. Chicago: 1915.

In this very suggestive but somewhat too facile attempt to trace the foundations of a methodical study of literature the ballad-dance is regarded as the embryo from which arise the six elements of literary form: epic, lyric, drama, history, philosophy, oratory. By combinations and recombinations of these elements the literary forms (Greek epic, medieval epic, Greek drama, dramatic lyric, idyl, elegy, etc.) develop. These forms, moreover, are not static (cf. 'fallacy of kinds'), but evolutionary (pp. 11–74). The author's association of epic, lyric, and drama with description, reflection, and presentation, respectively, should be scrutinized. Does he make sufficiently plain the interrelation of these six terms? Is there a common basis of division for the last three? — Lyric is shown to have a close affinity for both epic and drama, so that "at any moment, without ceasing to be lyric, it can dip on one side and become narrative, and dip on the other side into the monologue of dramatic presentation" (p. 44; cf. p. 197). For an attempt to mark out the forms of lyric poetry and the forces underlying their differentiation, see pp. 197–218.

Müller, E.

See below, § 8.

Müller, K. O. History of the Literature of Ancient Greece.

See below, § 5.

Mure, W. Critical History of the Language and Literature of Ancient Greece.

See below, § 5.

Neilson, W. A. Essentials of Poetry. Boston: 1912.

These, the Lowell lectures of 1911, present an original and very stimulating discussion of the principal tendencies exhibited in the history of poetry: Romanticism, "the tendency characterized by the predominance of imagination over reason and the sense of fact"; Classicism, "the tendency characterized by the predominance of reason over imagination and the sense of fact"; Realism, "the tendency characterized by the predominance of the sense of fact over imagination and reason." The essay considers also the minor qualities of sentiment and humor. It is poetic as well as critical in insight, and it illuminates with vivid color many of the by-paths of literary appreciation. On the predominance of the lyric in romantic periods, see pp. 61–62; on Burns as a realist in song, pp. 146–151.

NOBLE, J. A. The Sonnet in England. In *Contemp. Rev.*, 1880; also in book form, Lond.: 1893.

The first few pages deal briefly with the definition and nature of the sonnet.

OMOND, T. S. English Metrists in the Eighteenth and Nineteenth Centuries. Oxford: 1907.

PALGRAVE, F. T. Golden Treasury of the best Songs and Lyrical Poems in the English Language. Cambridge: 1861.

Preface.

Palgrave holds that the lyric turns "on some single thought, feeling, or situation," what might be called the unity of emotion. Compare Posnett, *op. cit. infra*, pp. 38–39. Notice also the criticisms in Palgrave's notes, the reading of which Professor Woodberry pronounces "almost an education in poetic taste." See Introd. to Henley's English Lyrics for criticism of Palgrave's definition.

PATMORE, C. Poems. Lond.: 1897.

Vol. II.

Preface on Ode. For other references on the Ode, see above, § 1, IV, C.

PATTISON, M. Essay on the Sonnet. In an ed. of "Milton's Sonnets." 1888.

One of the principal English essays upon the sonnet.

PECHEL, R. Christian Wernickes Epigramme. In *Palaestra*, LXXI. Berlin: 1909.

Pp. 3–23 Geschichte der Theorie des Epigramms von Scaliger bis zu Wernicke.

The introduction contains an admirable review of the principal theoretical discussions of the epigram.

PECK, H. T. The Lyrics of Tennyson. In Studies in Several Literatures. N.Y.: 1909.

In this popular essay occurs a passage that very clearly emphasizes the elemental and emotional character of the lyric and roughly but conveniently summarizes the modern view of the historical appearance and development of the type. For the convenience of the student we quote at length:

> The lyric is the most interesting form of poetry that we have. It affects more human beings than any other kind. It is elemental. It is undoubtedly the first form of poetry that ever was evolved, the type out of which sprang all the others. For what is the lyric when you come to analyze it? It is the simplest and most natural literary expression of unmixed emotion — usually the emotion of an individual. It may be personal, or religious, or amatory, or patriotic; but in the beginning it must have been removed by only one stage from cries, ejaculations, shouts — primitive expressions of pure feeling. Now, just as, all over the world, a cry of passion or of pain is understood by every human being, so is the lyric the nearest literary representative of an articulate cry. It began probably, as soon as language did, in simple lines and with a short refrain. It gradually developed into a longer and more artificial kind of verse. But because it represents feeling rather than complex thought, it goes straightest and surest to the human heart. Men and women who care nothing for any other sort of poetry instinctively love the lyric in many of its forms, as the old familiar "pennyroyal hymns" of the New Englander, or the patriotic song, or the love poem, or the battle chant — all the way up the scale of genius from Wesley to Campbell, and from Campbell to Burns and Longfellow and Tennyson. The lyric speaks out from the heart the things which belong to every nature; and thus it is the most primitive kind of poetry.

PLESSIS, F. Études critiques sur Properce et ses élégies. Paris: 1884.

An exhaustive study of the manuscripts, text, and genius of Propertius. Pp. 247–306 contain a brief history of classical elegy and a discussion of the place of Propertius therein. In a discussion of the nature of the elegy the author maintains that the view of the elegy as an intermediate form between the epic and the lyric is quite inadequate. He believes that the nature of the elegy should be defined with relation to what it was at the moment of its highest development, which is represented by the Roman elegies of Tibullus, Propertius, and Ovid.

Poe, E. A. Complete Works. Ed. by E. C. Stedman and G. E. Woodberry. 10 vols. Chicago: 1894, etc.

Vol. VI, pp. 3–30 The Poetic Principle; pp. 31–46 The Philosophy of Composition.

Is not Poe's doctrine of the short poem a doctrine of the lyric rather than of poetry as a whole?

Posnett, H. M. Comparative Literature. N.Y.: 1896.

On the relativity, or variety, of the lyric in form and subject, see pp. 38–41.

Quadrio, F. Della storia e della ragione d'ogni poesia. 7 vols. Bologna e Milano: 1739–1752.

Vol. II Melic (Lyric) Poetry. Cf. below, § 5.

In this vast treatise, historical and theoretical, the student will find a myriad references and annotations relating to the genres in ancient and modern national literatures. All data must be checked, and extraordinary mistakes may be noted; but even so Quadrio still remains for the exhaustive student a storehouse of facts. He is particularly valuable for his data on the Latin and vernacular literature of the Renaissance. Quadrio's encyclopedia should be used in conjunction with that of Sulzer-Blankenburg (*op. cit. infra*): the two constitute an indispensable though often untrustworthy apparatus.

Quiller-Couch, A. T. English Sonnets. Lond.: 1910.

Introduction.

Reed, E. B. English Lyrical Poetry. New Haven: 1912.

Pp. 1–13 The Lyric Defined.

"All songs; all poems following classic lyric forms; all short poems expressing the writer's moods and feelings in a rhythm that suggests music, are to be considered lyrics." For a review of this book see *The Nation* (N. Y.), vol. XCV, p. 261. It is the pioneer in its field. It contains much information, a mass of comment on particular authors and poems, but only the simplest of generalizations regarding the lyrical character of the various ages of English literary history.

RHYS, E. Lyric Poetry. Lond.: 1913.
Foreword, pp. v–viii.

To much of appreciation there is joined in this book a very small amount of theory or scientific research. In the *Foreword* "lyrical" is said to imply "a form of musical utterance in words governed by overmastering emotion and set free by a powerfully concordant rhythm." "Unless there is a concurrence between the contemporary idioms and rhythms of a period, with [sic] the individual idiom of the lyrist, half the expressional force of his ideas will be lost. . . . The danger is that under the modern bookish order the natural concert between the mind of the poet and the larger mind and rhythm of his time is broken" (pp. vi, vii). For a review of this book see *The Nation* (N. Y.), vol. XCVIII, p. 232.

RICHTER, J. P. F. Vorschule der Aesthetik.
See the Werke, 60 Theile, Berlin (G. Hempel): n. d., Th. 49–51, Abth. II, Progr. XIII, § 75, pp. 280–286.

"Das Epos stellt die Begebenheit, die sich aus der Vergangenheit entwickelt, das Drama die Handlung, welche sich für und gegen die Zukunft ausdehnt, die Lyra die Empfindung dar, welche sich in die Gegenwart einschliesst" (p. 281).

ROCAFORT, J. Les doctrines littéraires de l'Encyclopédie, ou le romantisme des Encyclopédistes. Paris: 1890.

A very helpful digest of the literary criticism of the great *Encyclopédie*. The student may turn with ease to summaries of the criticism of the various types and subtypes.

SAINTE-BEUVE, C. A. Premiers Lundis, 3 vols.; Causeries du Lundi, 16 vols.; Nouveaux Lundis, 13 vols.; Portraits

Contemporains, 5 vols.; Portraits Littéraires, 3 vols. Various editions and dates, from 1832 on.

English translations of portions of the above: E. J. Trechmann, 7 vols., Lond. (New Universal Library); A. J. Butler, Select Essays of Sainte-Beuve, Lond.: n.d.; K. P. Wormeley, Portraits of the Seventeenth Century, 2 vols., N.Y. and Lond.: 1905; W. Matthews, Monday Chats, Chicago: 1878; English Portraits, by C. A. Sainte-Beuve, N.Y.: 1875. — On Sainte-Beuve, see L. Séché, Sainte-Beuve, 2 vols., 4th ed., Paris: 1904.

Sainte-Beuve's essays, ~~subjective in method, but~~ based on wide reading and not a little of systematic research, afford an intimate, critical, and running history of French literature, particularly of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. Sainte-Beuve is not eloquent upon general philosophical theories about literature. He prefers to keep close to the author under consideration. The student of the theory of types will, therefore, find in him apparently little of direct value. But for the integration of French literature and the spirit of the whole there is no better *vade mecum* than that afforded by Sainte-Beuve's criticism.

Saintsbury, G. The Historical Character of the English Lyric. Read Oct., 1912. In *Proceedings of the British Academy*, vol. V.

On the "Protean variety of form" of the English lyric, with animadversion on any attempt at its classification.

Saintsbury, G. A History of Criticism and Literary Taste in Europe from the Earliest Texts to the Present Day. 3 vols. Lond.: 1900–1904; 2d and 3d eds. 1905–08.

This monumental survey of the history of criticism, the first of its kind and the indispensable desk-companion of every student of criticism, is based on a conception of poetry that is antagonistic to all criticism of poetic kinds. But the volumes abound in admirable summaries and other indications of the contents of an immense number of critical works, and consequently furnish the student not only with the bibliography essential to an investigation of the moot-question of literary types in general, but with definite clues to the chief critical utterances bearing upon the particular subject of his inquiry.

SAINTSBURY, G. A History of English Prosody from the Twelfth Century to the Present Day. 3 vols. Lond.: 1906–1910.

Professor Saintsbury's work is indispensable to a comprehension of the development of the technique of lyric verse and the value of its respective modes. Of the lyric he says that perhaps it "is, after all, the central, the highest, the most natural and essential form of poetry; so that the more poetical a time is the better will it show in lyric, and the more favorable the mechanical aids and circumstances, the better will lyric show in them" (vol. II, p. 350; cf. Jouffroy, Gosse, above). It is only after a study of such materials as are here amassed, adequately ordered and luminously discussed, that the student can with any degree of certainty venture even to test the validity of a dictum so vital, or of the many other pronouncements of like importance with which this learned contribution to the history and theory of English poetry abounds.

SCHELLING, F. E. English Literature during the Lifetime of Shakespeare. N.Y.: 1910.

Chap. VIII, pp. 120–121.

Dual nature of the lyric: song-like quality; subjective or personal quality. As corollaries: the lyric "must deal with passion and emotion in their simplicity as contrasted with the drama which is busied with both in their complexity"; must be "emotion clothed in beautiful and musical language"; free from narration and description except as they may furnish foundation for a mood; free from didactic, expository, and argumentative purposes.

SCHELLING, F. E. The English Lyric. Boston: 1913.

Chap. I, Definitions.

The obvious characteristics of the lyric are noted in a brief, informal way. Consider the contention that misanthropy and cynicism are repugnant to poetry and dangerous to the lyric. The author does not say that these emotions lie outside the range of the lyric. Other works by the same author are noted below, § 5. This work is reviewed in *The Nation* (N.Y.) of May 8, 1913.

SCHELLING, F. W. J. VON. Sämmtliche Werke. Stuttgart: 1856–61.
Abt. I, Bd. V Philosophie der Kunst, pp. 639–645.

The lyric represents the infinite in the finite, the universal in the particular, with a consciousness of an antithesis between them. In attaining this particularity of the lyric, the Greeks were objective and realistic, — the moderns subjective. The lyric arose, in Greece and Italy, in connection with the establishment of republican principles of government. Compare the notice on F. W. J. von Schelling below, § 8.

SCHIPPER, J. Englische Metrik in historischer und systematischer Entwicklung dargestellt. 3 vols. Bonn: 1882–89. Also an abstract of this work under the title, Grundriss der englischen Metrik (in *Wiener Beiträge zur engl. Philol.*, Bd. 2. Vienna: 1895), which has been translated as the History of English Versification. (Oxford: 1910.)

For comment on these standard works, see Gayley and Scott, pp. 480–481.

SCHOPENHAUER, A. The World as Will and as Idea. Trans. by Haldane and Kemp. 3 vols. Lond.: 1883.
Vol. I, pp. 321–324.

Schopenhauer argues that the lyric is the most subjective and consequently the easiest form of poetic expression. It is, however, hardly sufficient to say that a "lively perception of his own state at a moment of emotional excitement" is all that the poet needs in order to produce a song. And it may be questioned whether Schopenhauer's examples of isolated love songs and national songs prove his point: that lyric poets are frequently not capable of more than one lyric or of anything else but the lyric species.

Note, p. 322, The universality of the lyric emotion and expression; p. 323, The subject of the lyric: a desire satisfied or restricted. Is the lyric mood a vibration between the peace of pure contemplation and the unrest of desire? Is youth the season best adapted to the production and appreciation of the lyric?

SELLAR, W. Y. Roman Poets of the Augustan Age. Horace and the Elegiac Poets. Ed. by W. P. Ker. Oxford: 1892.

Chaps. V, VI Horace as a Lyric Poet. See also the admirable studies, the best in English, of the elegiac poets, Tibullus, Propertius, and Ovid.

SELLAR, W. Y. Roman Poets of the Republic. 3d ed. Oxford: 1889.

SHAIRP, J. C. Aspects of Poetry. Boston: 1882.

Consult especially the entertaining chapters (pp. 164–295) on Scottish Song and Burns, Shelley as a Lyric Poet, The Poetry of the Scottish Highlands, Modern Gaelic Bards, The Three Yarrows. Consider the statement (p. 65) that youth is the time of lyrical inspiration and that "most of the great lyrists have done their pipings before forty." Are lyrics composed in mature life the "products of emotion remembered in tranquillity"?

SHARP, W. English Odes. Lond.: 1890.

The prefatory essay, Great Odes, is reprinted in vol. II of the Selected Writings of William Sharp (1912).

The English ode is described as follows:

> It may be suggested that any poem finely wrought and full of high thinking, which is of the nature of an apostrophe or of sustained intellectual meditation on a single theme of general purport, should be classed as an ode. . . . Then it must be impersonal, in the sense that it must not be a direct personal outcry, though in common with all true poetry, it must be absolutely individualistic in utterance. . . . The form must neither be narrative nor dramatic, nor, again, be of an obtrusively choric nature.

SHARP, W. Sonnets of the Nineteenth Century. Lond.: 1886.

See the prefatory essay, The Sonnet, its History and Characteristics, which is reprinted in vol. II of the Selected

Writings of William Sharp (1912). See the same author's Songs and Sonnets of Shakespeare (1885), the introduction to which is also included in vol. II of the Writings.

The appreciative prefatory essay contains a critical and historical account of the sonnet. Notice the summary of "ten absolutely essential rules for a good sonnet."

SHELLEY, P. B. A Defense of Poetry (1821). Ed. by A. S. Cook. Boston: 1891.

Cf. Gayley and Scott, § 20.

The passage beginning "Poetry is not like reasoning . . ." (p. 39, l. 5–p. 41, l. 21) describes the lyric genius more adequately than it does the genius of poetry in general. Shelley maintains that the ancient bucolic poets illustrated a decline of poetry coincident with the degeneration in civil life.

SHENSTONE, W. A Prefatory Essay on Elegy. In the Works in Verse and Prose of William Shenstone, Esq. 2 vols. Lond.: 1764. Vol. I, pp. 3–12.

One of the few essays in English upon the elegy. The full variety of the elegy, historically considered, is not covered; but it is pointed out that in general the elegy connotes "a tender and querulous idea," that it may bewail the dead, or express the grief of absent or neglected lovers, and that from telling the grief of lovers it expanded to celebrate their "spoils, triumphs, ovations, and rejoicings." The end of the elegy, according to Shenstone, is to illustrate, endear, and encourage the private virtues, whereas "epic and tragedy chiefly recommend the public virtues." For English elegiac verse the author prefers and uses the heroic metre with alternate rhyme.

SMITH, K. F. The Elegies of Albius Tibullus. N.Y.: 1913.

The introduction to this edition of Tibullus affords a brief but admirable historical survey of the elegy with copious citation of recent authorities. For criticism of the art of Tibullus, see pp. 65–73, 91–106.

STEDMAN, E. C. The Nature and Elements of Poetry. Boston: 1892.

References to the lyric may be traced by means of the index. Valuable and profound suggestions are scattered throughout the book. "Careful distinction is made between poetry which expresses the self-consciousness of the author, and that which represents life and thought apart from his individuality."

STEDMAN, E. C. Poets of America. Boston and N.Y.: 1886.

Pp. 18–21, etc. More chance for lyric than dramatic poetry in American life. Criticisms of American lyrists: p. 40, Halleck; p. 58, Stoddard; pp. 80–83, Bryant; pp. 150–171, Emerson; pp. 191–192, Longfellow; p. 240 ff., Poe; pp. 315–316, 339, Lowell; p. 353, Whitman; p. 440, Aldrich.

STEDMAN, E. C. The Victorian Poets. Boston: 1879.

P. 101 The musical quality of song; p. 45 Criticism of Landor's verse; p. 92 Arnold's imperfect rhythm; p. 302 Browning's intervals of melody; pp. 320, 328–329 Dramatic quality of Browning's lyrics; p. 365 Rossetti's style; p. 394 Swinburne's.

STEUERWALD, W. Lyrisches in Shakespere. München: 1881.

See *Shakespeare Jahrbuch*, vol. XVII, pp. 272–273.

SULZER, J. G. Allgemeine Theorie der schönen Künste. 4 vols. and Register. 2d ed. Leipz.: 1782–1799 (1st ed. 2 vols. 1771–74).

See also F. von Blankenburg, Litterarische Zusätze zu J. G. Sulzer's Allgemeiner Theorie, etc. 3 vols. Leipz.: 1796–98. In the present work all references noted Blankenburg-Sulzer are to these Zusätze.

A veritable mine of older criticism and bibliographical material. The poetic types and subtypes are treated in separate articles. In general each article covers ancient (Greek and Roman) literature and the chief modern European literatures (Italian, Spanish, French, English, German) up to the closing years of the 18th century.

The data offered for each type are arranged under national divisions and consist of a chronological list of the critical treatises on the type and a roster of poets and their works. It is at once obvious that a compendium of such scope is of great value, in spite of its inaccuracies, for it at least serves to guide the student to surer information. Cf. Quadrio, above. For the lyric, see the articles Chor, Choral, Dichtkunst (Poesie, Poetik), Dithyramben, Elegie, Epodos, Gedicht, Hymne, Lied, Lyrisch, Ode, Rondeau, Sinngedicht, Sonnet; also under the names of the great lyric poets. On Sulzer see Braitmaier, Gesch. d. poet. Theorie, etc. (1888), Pt. 2, p. 55 ff.

SUTTERMEISTER, O. Leitfaden der Poetik für den Schul- und Selbst-Unterricht. 2d ed. Zürich: 1874.

Pp. 59–70, 33 ff.

A simple, appreciative, and convenient compendium of the usual remarks on the nature and kinds of the lyric. Note the passage on the translation of the lyric (pp. 61–62). Does not the nature of the lyric render the task of translation especially difficult?

SWINBURNE, A. C. William Blake. New ed. N.Y.: 1906.

In his enthusiastic study of one of the greatest of pure lyrists Mr. Swinburne unites an ardor of description and subtlety of interpretation which are possibly more creative than critical. At any rate, the student will find Chap. II, Lyrical Poems, refreshing and suggestive, — capable of awakening a keen perception of the beauties of lyric poetry in general.

SYMONDS, J. A. A Comparison of Elizabethan and Victorian Poetry. In *Fortn. Rev.*, 51: 55.

SYMONDS, J. A. Renaissance in Italy. 7 vols. N.Y.: 1879 ff.

Italian Literature, Pt. I, Chaps. I–IV, VI Provençal lyric, and Italian popular and metaphysical lyrics; The Fine Arts, App. II, Michael Angelo's Sonnets.

Symonds, J. A. The Lyrism of the English Romantic Drama. In *Fortn. Rev.*, 53: 331.

Symonds, J. A. Studies of the Greek Poets. 2 vols. N.Y.: 1880.
See below, § 5.

Taylor, H. O. The Classical Heritage of the Middle Ages. N.Y.: 1901.

Chap. IX Christian Poetry: classic metre and Christian emotion, Greek Christian poetry, early Latin Christian poetry, the transition to medieval Latin poetry.

The remarks on the elegiac and lyric metres of the ancient Greeks and the lyric poems of early Greek and Latin Christianity are just and illuminating. For other references on early Christian lyric, especially elegiac, verse, see below, § 6.

Thompson, F. Shelley. In *The Dublin Review*. July, 1908. Also in book form, N.Y.: 1909.

A remarkable estimate of Shelley, with much on the marvellous character of Shelley's lyric genius.

Thurau, G. Der Refrain in der französischen Chanson. In *Litthist. Forschungen*, No. 23. 1901.

Tomlinson, C. The Sonnet. Its Origin, Structure, and Place in Poetry, etc. Lond.: 1874.

An account and comparison of Italian and English forms of the sonnet with particular attention to Petrarch. For other references on the sonnet, see Gayley and Scott, pp. 504–505; also above, § 1, iv, d, and below, § 6, xxxiv, d.

Ulrici, H. Shakespeare's Dramatic Art. Bohn's Lib. Trans. by Dora Schmitz. 2 vols. Lond.: 1876.

Vol. I, pp. 325–326.

A general statement of the relative conditions and functions of epic, lyric, and dramatic poetry. The "subjectivity of the lyric must be universal"; the lyric exhibits not actions, but the sources of action, the mind in ferment of becoming. The form is therefore free. To what extent is the lyric the poetry of future events as contrasted with the epic, — the poetry of past events? Compare the lyrical with the heroic (or epical) treatment of the divine.

VERRIER, M. Essai sur la métrique anglaise. 3 vols. Paris: 1909.

VIEHOFF, H. Die Poetik auf der Grundlage der Erfahrungsseelenlehre. Trier: 1888.

Pp. 469–494. See Gayley and Scott, p. 343.

VIEHOFF, H. Ueber den innern Bau und den Abschluss des lyrischen Gedichtes. In *Herrig's Archiv.*, 35: 1–34.

The chapter in the Poetik (1888) contains most of the conclusions arrived at in Herrig (1865). The article Ueber den Bau, etc., confines itself principally to modern German lyrics, and from a study of certain poems of Chamisso, Freiligrath, Goethe, Schiller, etc., reaches the induction that the lyric expresses the development of a powerful impulse, sometimes selfish, sometimes unhappy, sometimes fantastic, into a higher, nobler feeling, an appreciation of reality. Consider carefully the systems of lyric development suggested, pp. 20–21, and of lyric endings, pp. 32–34. The theories of Gottschall and Vischer are worthily combated.

VILLEMAIN, M. Essais sur le génie de Pindare et sur la poésie lyrique dans ses rapports avec l'élévation morale et religieuse des peuples. Paris: 1859.

Villemain, like Lowth (to whom he refers as "dans son admiration un peu scolastique"), emphasizes the sacred and oriental character and origin of the lyric. Few works present a finer or fresher appreciation of Greek and Latin lyrics, and what of modern erudition the student misses in this book is more than compensated for by the contagion of Villemain's enthusiasm. And, after all, in a large way, is not Villemain right as well as eloquent? The work extends its view to include modern Europe.

VINCENT, ABBÉ C. Théorie des genres littéraires. Paris: 1902.

A brief, popular, and superficial account of the literary kinds.

Vischer, F. T. Aesthetik, etc. 3 vols. Reutlingen-Stuttgart: 1846–57.

Bd. III, Thl. 3, Abschn. 2, Hft. 5, pp. 1322–1374.

Vischer, an Hegelian, expatiates upon the nature of the lyric (1322–1342). "Die dichtende Phantasie stellt sich auf den Standpunkt der Empfindenden." This stage, according to Vischer, succeeds the epic. In the epic, "das Subject unterordnet sich dem Objecte." In the lyric we have reached "eine weitere Stufe auf welche die Welt in das Subject eingeht, und von ihm durchdrungen wird, so dass alles Objective als dessen inneres Leben erscheint, u. s. w." Note especially § 886 on the volume of a poet's work necessary to an understanding of his individuality; and § 887: "(1) Eine Lyrik des Aufschwungs zum Gegenstande, (2) eine andere des reinen Aufgehens des letzteren im Subjecte, (3) und eine dritte der beginnenden und wachsenden Ablösung aus ihm — oder der Betrachtung." In §§ 890–894 these three kinds of the lyric, and their subkinds, are briefly discussed: § 890 hymn, dithyramb, ode; 891–893 song, ballad, romance; 894 elegy, oriental lyric, sonnet, epigram, etc.

Wackernagel, W. Poetik, Rhetorik und Stilistik. Ed., L. Sieber. 3d ed. Halle a. S.: 1906.

Pp. 156–225.

A suggestive but somewhat too schematic account. The lyric is distinguished as at once egoistic and cosmopolitan (rather than national, as is the epic), as individual, subjective, and emotional in character. But does not this apply to a comparatively late stage of the lyric, rather than to the lyric as a whole? What of the earlier, objective, communal lyric? Of it Wackernagel has little to say. He derives the lyric as he has defined it not from an early communal and choral poetry, but from the lyrical handling of epic material ('lyrical epic'; cf. p. 120 ff.). From this the lyric passes through stages denominated as epical lyric and didactic lyric to the pure or lyrical lyric. Under the epical lyric are discussed the Heroides of Ovid, the elegy (an extensive and valuable contribution), the epigram of feeling, lyrical occasional verse, the lay (*Leich*), church song, ode, etc.; under the didactic lyric are grouped lyric-didactic, gnomic, proverbial, and descriptive poetry, the lampoons of Archilochus, the epistle, the epigram of learning and wit, the riddle, etc.; under lyrical lyric, Greek melic verse and the German *Lied* are briefly noted. From this classification it is evident that Wackernagel disposes of didactic verse in part under the lyric. Another part he places under the epic ('didactic epic,' p. 131). Justify this division. Which is the primary trait, didactic or lyric? Can it be shown that Wackernagel's classification of subkinds under the didactic lyric is substantially in accordance with actual historical development?

Watts-Dunton, W. T. Poetry. In Encyc. Brit. 11th ed.

This article and the author's Renascence of Wonder are reprinted, with certain additions, in book form: Poetry and the Renascence of Wonder. Ed., Thomas Hake (Lond. and N.Y.: n.d.).

Two kinds of vision, absolute and relative. Of relative vision, also two kinds: semi-lyric (semi-dramatic), and purely lyric or egoistic. How does the division apply to lyric poets? Are there no lyrics of absolute vision or imagination? For criticism of Watts' theory of imagination, see Gayley and Scott, § 20. Under the comparative study of lyrics, notice the following statements: the great lyric is Hebrew; it must be religious; its elements are unconsciousness, power, and grace. In connection with the peculiarities of the Ode, one may ask whether the Pindaric arrangement can be successfully modernized; and what is the relation of metre to thought in the ode. Under Song: Are its characteristics heartiness and melody? Elegy and Sonnet, and the improvisatorial peasant poetry of Italy — *rispetti* and *stornelli* — are briefly mentioned. See Gayley and Scott, § 23, for references on versification of sonnet, etc.

Watts-Dunton, W. T. Sonnet. In Encyc. Brit. 11th ed.

An admirable short review of the nature, function, and varieties of the sonnet. The author's chief contribution to the theory of the sonnet is the "wave theory," which likens the metrical movement of the sonnet (particularly the Petrarchan variety) to the rise and subsidence of a wave. This theory was first formulated in the author's Sonnet on the Sonnet.

Wendell, B. A Literary History of America. N.Y.: 1901.

P. 216 Poe's lyric conception; p. 485 ff. Lyrical quality in Southern poetry.

Werner, R. M. Lyrik und Lyriker. Eine Untersuchung. Hamburg: 1890. (In Lipps and Werner's *Beiträge*, etc.)

The most considerable work yet undertaken on the theory of the lyric. It is to the author's credit that instead of spinning from his consciousness a web of theory he has experimented upon the lyric itself. As a result, he has produced a rich and methodical study, somewhat similar in style to Viehoff's article in Herrig (see above). Professor Werner first investigates the feelings, emotions, and reflections properly called lyrical and then divides the poetry in which they are expressed into the lyric of the emotions and the lyric of contemplation. He discriminates the characteristics of the lyric ~~from those~~ of other literary types; then, tracing by practical induction the inner evolution of the lyric, he finds the following stages: Erlebniss, Stimmung, Befruchtung, Keim, inneres Wachstum, äusseres Wachstum. The student will stand aghast before the two hundred and fifty and more possibilities evolved, but he will perhaps forgive the author in consideration of his other services. For reviews, see: *Literarisches Centralblatt*, 1891, No. 22; *Jahresbericht für neuere deutsche Litteraturgeschichte*, Bd. I, 1ter Halbbd., pp. 22–24; *ibid.* II, 1, 32, note, and 34, note; see also below, § 4, IV, A, for an account of Werner's classification of the lyric.

White, G. Ballades and Rondeaus, Chants Royal, Sestinas, Villanelles, etc., Selected by G. W. Lond. (Walter Scott Pub. Co.): n.d.

To this collection of English imitations of Old French lyric metres is prefaced an account of the early French and Provençal use of these forms, and rules for their construction. For further references on these charming measures, see below, § 6, VII, B–F, and below, § 5, H. L. Cohen.

WINCHESTER, C. T. Some Principles of Literary Criticism. N. Y.: 1899.

The lyric cannot be the immediate and spontaneous utterance of the poet's passion, for if it were it could not be given a measured and calculated expression. The lyric results from a genuine emotional experience regarded as a subject and as representative of the passions of humanity in general (165–166). Since the utterance of feeling may be as manifold and varied as the infinite possibilities of personality, the lyric is the most universal form of poetry (275). The student will do well to test the validity of the concealed major premises in some of Professor Winchester's arguments.

WOLFF, E. Poetik. Die Gesetze der Poesie in ihrer geschichtlichen Entwicklung. Oldenburg und Leipz.: 1899.

Pp. 119–177; cf. below, § 5.

In this admirable little work, undertaken with an aim to establish inductively the laws of the poetry of the past (not the rules for the poetry of the future), a careful survey of Oriental, Greek, Provençal, and German lyric poetry results in this definition: "Die Lyrik ist Kundgabe und Vermittlung lebhafter Empfindungen über einen dargestellten, allgemeiner Teilnahme würdigen Gegenstand" (p. 177). Should not the singable quality be noted?

WOLFF, E. Prolegomena der litterar-evolutionistischen Poetik. Kiel und Leipz.: 1890.

See pp. 9–10, and § 8, below.

The effect of the lyric is defined as "die ja als unmittelbarer Ausdruck von Empfindungen auch unmittelbarer ähnliche bestimmte Empfindungen in uns wachruft: etwa 'Entladung von eignen, in uns schlummernden Empfindungen durch Darstellung der Empfindungen anderer'" (p. 24).

WOODBERRY, G. E. The Appreciation of Literature. N.Y.: 1907.
Chap. II Lyrical Poetry.

"It remains true, however, that the substance of the lyric, the essential experience which it contains, is the emotion, and not the image set forth in words which indeed exists only to suggest or discharge the emotion. . . . Lyrics . . . are symbols of universal emotion which is conveyed or roused by the imagery. . . . The lyric defines and releases this vague emotion which is forever arising in experience; this is its function, its ground of being in art, its use to the world." The *catharsis* of the lyric lies "in the exhaustion rather than the satisfaction of the emotion. On the scale of longer [lyric] poetry, this repose is obtained by a prophetic touch." The essay has much to say concerning the methods of gaining an appreciation of lyric poetry, and is very valuable to beginners on this account.

WORDSWORTH, W. Prose Works. Ed. by A. B. Grosart. 3 vols. Lond.: 1876.
Vol. II, pp. 79–100; 101–105; 106–130; 131–143.

Especially in the Preface to the Lyrical Ballads and in the Preface to the Poems of 1815 Wordsworth develops his theory of poetry. As a writer of presentative poetry his theories apply more pertinently to lyric, idyllic, and didactic types than to the dramatic or epic. His description of the poet's mind and function (Preface to Lyrical Ballads) and his analysis of the powers predominant in the production of poetry (Preface of 1815) are matter for serious and repeated consideration. In his theory of poetry and in his theory of criticism (Appendix to Poems of 1815) Wordsworth has laid the foundation for many of the literary opinions for which the world gives credit to critics who have followed him. See Gayley and Scott, § 20.

YOUNG, E. Works. 3 vols. Lond.: 1798.
Vol. III, pp. 219–223 On Lyric Poetry.

On the sublime and "immethodical" nature of the Ode. "But then in ode, there is this difference from other kinds of poetry:

that, there, the imagination, like a very beautiful mistress, is indulged in the appearance of domineering; though the judgment, like an artful lover, in reality carries its point." Young's influence upon Germany (and Spain) should be noted.

ZIMMERMANN, F. Ueber den Begriff des Epos. Darmstadt: 1848.

On the subjective tendency in the objective or dramatic lyric, see the Note, p. 2:

Diejenige Lyrik, welche zu erzählen oder dramatisch darzustellen scheint, geniesst doch in der Erzählung nur ihre eigene Bewegung, gleichviel ob in Form objective Lyrik, wie Pindar's Siegeslieder, oder in der Form lyrischer, oft in dramatischen Absätzen auseinander springender Erzählung, wie die Ballade.

SECTION 3. OUTLINES OF THEORY BY NATIONALITIES: SPECIAL REFERENCES

In tracing in historical order the minor references to the theory of the lyric, the student will find it convenient to refer to Gayley and Scott, Methods and Materials of Lit. Crit., Chap. VI, where the history of poetics in general is outlined. To be sure, no study is made there of particular types; but the list of the chief ancient and modern Poetics will be of considerable aid.

The following notes are in aim representative rather than exhaustive. In making use of them the student should bear in mind that the most important references, already cited in § 2, are seldom repeated.

General critical apparatus for the study of the various centuries of national literary history will be found under the Historical Study by Nationalities, § 6, below.

I. **Ancient (Greek and Roman) Theory of the Lyric.**

For introductions to the history of Greek poetical theory in general see É. Egger's Essai sur l'histoire de la critique chez les Grecs (2d ed. Paris: 1886); Saintsbury's Hist. Crit., Vol. I, Bk. i. W. von Christ's Gesch. der griech. Litt. (5th ed., noted below, § 5) should also be consulted both for historical information and for bibliography. Bernhardy's

Grundriss (noted above, § 2) contains much valuable material, especially for the Alexandrian period. The Hist. of Classical Scholarship (Vol. I, 2d ed. 1906) by J. E. Sandys includes a review of Greek scholarship that is most helpful in exploring the difficult fields of Hellenistic textual, grammatical, and rhetorical criticism. For a condensed account see the same author's article "Classics" in the Encyc. Brit., 11th ed. An excellent brief review of the Greek rhetoricians is contained in the Introduction to W. R. Roberts' Demetrius on Style (Cambridge: 1902). For an account of Greek aesthetic theory, of particular value in dealing with post-Aristotelian philosophical criticism, see Bernard Bosanquet's Hist. of Aesthetic (Lond.: 1892).

Introductions to the history of Roman poetical theory are Saintsbury's Hist. Crit., Vol. I, Bk. ii; H. Nettleship's Lit. Crit. in Latin Antiquity (in *Journal of Philol.* 18: 225. 1890); cf. W. R. Hardie, Lit. Crit. at Rome, Chap. VIII in Lects. on Classical Subjects (Lond.: 1903). The histories of Teuffel and Schanz (noted below, § 5), the Roman Grundriss of Bernhardy (noted above, § 2), and Sandys and Bosanquet as noted in the previous paragraph, should also be consulted.

Ancient criticism had but little to say of the lyric. The slight notice taken of this type by Aristotle (see above, § 2) was in part responsible for this neglect; still more so, the universal habit of regarding the lyric as indissolubly united with music. No doubt, too, the difficulty of theorizing about a poetic type so spontaneous and evanescent was felt then as now. Plato regards the effect of the lyric as musical in character, — capable under proper supervision of great ethical influence; but he admits that when the lyre is used without words "it is difficult to recognize the meaning of the harmony and rhythm" (Laws VII 812, II 669; Protag. 326). The problem, at this point, calls for a consideration of the Greek conception of music as a species of imitation (see ITicher, Aristotle's Theory, etc., Chap. II, and cf. D. B. Monro, Modes of Ancient Greek Music, Oxford: 1894; see also F accom Greek Lyric Poets, Article V, for a brief account of musica above, pani-ment). — For the Greek classification of the lyric, set referer § 2, under Aristotle, and below, § 6, 1; the chief ancie Proclus (ce bearing upon this classification is the Χρηστομαθία of canon ut n Photius, Biblioth. p. 521 ff.). For the Alexandria y: f elegiac and lyric poets, see article "Classics" in Encyc. Brit., 11th ed.—Late writers in Greek are prone to cite the stylistic virtues of the Greek lyrists, but the citations are brief, and usually subordinated to some pedantic interest (see, e.g., Plutarch's remarks on Sappho, in his Eroticus 763 and Vit. Demetr. 907 B; the remarks on Sappho in the De Elocutione, §§ 140–143, attributed to Demetrius Phalereus—Ed. by W. R. Roberts, Demetrius on Style, Cambridge: 1902; and further on Sappho by Dionysius of Halicarnassus, De Comp. Verb. § 23, and by Longinus, De Sublimitate §§ 10, 33).

Roman critics are equally negligible. Horace (Ars Poetica, ll. 75–85; see Hurd's notes) remarks, in passing, on the fitness of certain metres to certain subjects, complains of servile imitators (Epist. I, xix), and gives his reasons for abandoning lyric poetry (Epist. II, ii). Quintilian's brief appraisals of the Greek lyrists will be found in the Institutes X, i, 61–64; of Horace he speaks in X, i, 97: these notices are among the best of the many critical 'tags' that may be found throughout classical criticism (for other notices see the works of Cicero, Ovid, Petronius, Seneca Rhetor, Seneca the Younger, Persius, Juvenal, Martial, Pliny the Younger, Aulus Gellius, Macrobius, Ausonius, etc.). For summaries of such notices from both Greek and Roman authors see the various sections devoted to melic poetry in Bernhardy's Grundriss and the proper articles in Pauly-Wissowa's Real-Encyclopädie (see, for example, Crusius' article *Elegie*, cited below, § 5); see also Nettleship's Lit. Crit. in Latin Antiquity (*Journ. Philol.*, 18: 230) and F. Barta's Ueber die auf d. Dichtkunst bezüglichen Ausdrücke bei den römischen Dichtern, 1 Dichten und Dichtern (Prog., Linz a. D.: 1889), 2 Gedicht (1890). J. A. Hartung's little work (cited in § 8) is less helpful on the lyric than on other types. On Aulus Gellius see B. Romano; La critica letteraria in A. Gellio, pp. 107–113 (Torino: 1902).

The technical school-grammars, even from their beginning in the works of Dionysius Thrax (80 B.C.), professed in general to include some sort of literary criticism in their conspectus (cf.

T. Davidson, The Grammar of Dionysius Thrax, St. Louis: 1874, p. 3), — a promise often observed in the breach except for brief and inadequate definitions of metres and kinds. For the Latin grammars see Keil's Grammatici Latini. On Greek grammarians and Latin and Greek rhetoricians, see Saintsbury, Sandys, and Roberts, as noted above.

Editions and Translations. See below, § 9, I, II.

II. The Dark Ages.

A brief introduction to the general criticism of this period will be found in Saintsbury's Hist. Crit., vol. I, pp. 371–415 (2d ed.). In H. O. Taylor's Classical Heritage of the Middle Ages (N.Y.: 1901), see Chaps. IV (Christian attitude toward literature and philosophy) and VIII (early Christian prose and apologetics), and bibliographical appendixes. The second volume of E. Norden's standard work, Die antike Kunstprosa (2 vols. Leipz.: 1898), contains matter relating to the critical attitude of the period. Guidance toward critical materials may also be had from the literary histories that cover parts or the whole of the period (see Ebert, Manitius, Gröber, Paul, and Ker, as noted below, § 5, and the references given below, § 12, IV. For editions of texts see Ebert and Manitius).

Upon lyric theory, in any broad sense of the term, patristic and pre-medieval Latin literature has practically nothing to say. The disapprobation with which the Fathers of the Church regarded all profane literature is noted below, § 9, III. For notices of Horace, Pindar, and other lyrists in the Ante-Nicene Fathers, see the General Index in vol. X of the American edition of the Ante-Nicene Fathers; similar notices may be found in Schaff's Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers. Negligible asides on the lyric may also be discovered in the encyclopedias and grammatical works of the time. Isidore of Seville's remarks (see below, § 9, III) may be taken as representative. He barely mentions lyric poetry (Etymologiæ, viii, 7, 4), says that David was the first to compose hymns in praise of God, and gives brief, inadequate definitions of epithalamium, threnos, elegy, bucolic, epitaph, epigram, and epode (*ibid.*, i, 39). In general it is maintained that the Hebrews first developed these arts. The student who desires to extend his knowledge of this arid field may do so by consulting the sources of Isidore's Etymologiæ (bibliography below, § 9, III).

With regard to the prosody of the church hymns, it should be noted that we have several references bearing upon the substitution of accentual rhythms for the classical quantitative measures. Hymns which employed the substitution were called " rhythmical." For examples of such references see Apollinaris Sidonius, Ep. ii, 10, and Bede, De Arte Metrica, Cap. 24: in Cap. 21 is Bede's explanation of the prosody of the Ambrosian hymn. For further notes on this subject see Archbishop Trench's Sacred Latin Poetry, Introd.

For the rest it may be noted that scattered remarks upon lyric quality and, particularly, lyric metres are to be found in Isidore of Seville's remarks on metrics (see Lib. I of his Etymologiæ), and in the various treatises on versification mentioned by Professor Saintsbury in his Hist. Crit., I, 407–415. For the texts see P. Leyser, Historia poetarum et poematum medii aevi (Halle: 1721); T. Wright and J. O. Halliwell, Reliquiae antiquae (2 vols. Lond.: 1845); G. Mari, I trattati medievali di ritmica latina (Milan: 1899).

III. **Italian.**

A history of Italian criticism of the lyric is a great desideratum. In the absence of such a manual the student must endeavor to sift the various " Poetics " of the sixteenth, seventeenth, and eighteenth centuries (for a list, see Gayley and Scott, pp. 445–448; see also the chapters devoted to criticism in the very valuable series known as Storia letteraria d' Italia scritta da una società di professori; Saintsbury, Hist. Crit.; Quadrio and Blankenburg, as noted above, § 2). To this task must be added that of gleaning from the historical works and monographs of the nineteenth century (many of which are mentioned below, § 6, VIII) stray comments or interpretations that have a theoretical bearing. The student's labor will be lightened if he first makes himself familiar with the principal guides to the history of the Italian lyric (see below, § 6, VIII).

A. *The Renaissance.*

For apparatus for studying the general critical trend of this period use the references given just above, and add: Spingarn, Lit. Crit. in the Renaissance (the best introductory survey); K. Vossler, Poetische Theorien in der italienischen Frührenaissance (in *Litterarhist. Forschuugen*, XII. 1900); the chapters devoted to criticism in V. Rossi's Il Quattrocento and F. Flamini's Il Cinquecento; C. Berardi, Per una storia della poetica nel cinque e nel seicento (in *Rassegna critica della letteratura italiana*, 16: 33–56. 1911). For editions, monographs, etc., see Rossi and Flamini.

Italian Renaissance criticism devoted most of its attention to the epic and drama. Dealing with the trend as a whole Professor Spingarn, in a passage we have already quoted, has only this to say of the criticism of the lyric:

> . . . during the Renaissance there was no systematic lyric theory. Those who discussed it at all gave most of their attention to its formal structure, its style, and especially the conceit it contained. The model of all lyrical poetry was Petrarch, and it was in accordance with the lyrical poet's agreement or disagreement with the Petrarchan method that he was regarded as a success or a failure (Lit. Crit. in the Renaissance, p. 58).

For this neglect one cause is to be found in the paucity of ancient theory concerning the type. Moreover, when the Italian critic of the Renaissance does pay attention to the nature of the lyric he at once feels himself the victim of an inherited dilemma: How, he asks, can the nature of the type be reconciled with the definition of poetry as an imitation of "men in action" (Aristotle, Poetics, II, i)? For the most part he ignores what Plato has said (see Gayley and Scott, pp. 139–144) about Love as a creator, a maker of poets; the object of love as birth in beauty, hence immortality; the truly initiated lover as the ideal poet; imitation as a productive or creative art; words as imitating the essence of things; the function of music and the relation of poetry to music. He also ignores what Aristotle has said or implied (see Gayley and Scott, pp. 145–156) concerning art as an imitation of nature, — that imitation is not a mere reproduction of nature as an object, but furthers the purposes of nature and the satisfaction of man's desires by adopting the methods and processes of nature as a productive principle; he ignores, also, what Aristotle has said of the dithyramb and melody as imitations, and of the power of passionate melodies to relieve the feelings.

A collection of the various solutions of the problem of poetry as an imitation of human action that have been offered by European critics from the Renaissance on would afford a valuable addition to the history of the criticism of the lyric. Below are cited only a few representative authors; for others, see the list of Italian "Poetics" referred to above.

G. G. Trissino treats of the sonnet, ballata, and canzone (Opere, 2 vols. Verona: 1729; see vol. II, pp. 137-139, 4th division. First ed., Pts. i-iv, 1529; v-vi, 1563). M. Equicola, Instituzioni all' comporre in ogni sorte di rima (Milano: 1541), — a prosodical manual, with which may be compared C. Tolomei's Versi e regole della nuova poesia toscana (Roma: 1539), G. Ruscelli's Trattato del modo di comporre in versi italiani (Ven.: 1559), L. Dolce's Osservazioni della volgar lingua, Lib. IV Della volgar poesia, e del modo ed ordine di comporre diverse maniere di rime (Ven.: 1563). To F. Robortelli's In librum Aristotelis de arte poetica explicationes (Firenze: 1548) is added a paraphrase of Horace's Art of Poetry, in which occur remarks on the elegy; the same volume contains essays on the epigram and the elegy. Girol. Muzio, Arte poetica (Vinegia: 1551). I. Anton. Viperanus, De poetica lib. III. (Antv.: 1558; Opera, Napoli: 1606); full contents in Blankenburg, I 387: lyric poetry is treated very briefly in Lib. III, Cap. IX-XII; Cap. X considers the question whether or not the lyric can be called poetry if the latter is "an imitation of human actions." Blankenburg calls the whole affair slight and superficial, — a commentary on Horace. The chapters are indeed short and slight, but the author has added much to Horace, of whose lack of system and definition he complains in the preface. Minturno (i.e. Antonio Sebastiano), De poeta (1559), Lib. V; by the same, L' Arte poetica (Venetia: 1564), Lib. I, III, or see index under Elegia, Lirica Poesia, Madrigalia, Melica, Canzone, Sestina, Sonetto. J. C. Scaliger (1561. *op. cit.* § 8. See Lib. I, Cap. XLIV-LVII; Lib. III, Cap. C-CXXVI; Lib. VI.). In Lib. VII, Cap. II Scaliger draws from the nature of the lyric an argument against Aristotle's theory of the imitative end of poetry, as did also, much later, Moses Mendelssohn and J. A. Schlegel. For Scaliger's ranking of the lyric as the excellent kind of poetry, see Lib. I, Cap. III (translated by F. M. Padelford, *op. cit.* § 8 under Scaliger, pp. 19–20). For the Pastoral, see Lib. I, Cap. IV; other types elsewhere. T. Tasso, Del poema eroico (*op. cit.* § 8); see pp. 204, 242: lyric and epic styles compared. Giov. Andrea Gilio da Fabriano's Topica poetica, etc. (Venetia: 1580) deals with poetic writing in general ('topics,' figures, 'examples,' etc.); quotes from lyrics not a little, and affords a fair conception of the pedantic attitude toward poetry. J. Denores, Poetica (1588). V. Toraldo da Arragonia, La Veronica, ovvero del sonetto dialog. (Genova: 1589). Blankenburg gives several Latin treatises on the elegy, under the article *Elegie*.

B. *The Seventeenth Century.*

On the poetical treatises of this century see the references at the head of these notes on the Italian lyric, and add: F. Foffano, Saggio su la critica letteraria nel sècolo decimosettimo (in Ricerche letterarie, Livorno: 1897, pp. 135–312; cf. *Giornale storico*, 31: 369–383); A. Belloni, Il Seicento, Chap. XI, and Bibliog. Appendix; C. Berardi, as noted above, under A; and the larger histories of Italian literature, especially Tiraboschi.

This century is still less prolific in criticism of the lyric. What occurs is philological, formal, and pedantic, — editions, annotations, "proginnasmi," etc. A. Tassoni, in his Considerazioni, etc. (Modena: 1609), treats Petrarch and his sonnets "as cavalierly as he was to treat the sacred Heroic Poem in the Secchia" (Saintsbury, Hist. Crit. II 326). For his Pensieri diversi (1612), in which he maintained the supremacy of the Italian lyric above that of Greece and Rome, see below, § 9, V, B. See also, in the same place, the reference to Boccalini. Quattromani's (Sertorio) Rime di Mons. Gio. della Casa (Napoli: 1616) is an example of pedantic annotation and criticism of sonnets. Cf. Horatio Marta's Paralello tra Petrarca e Monsign. Gio. della Casa (in Marta's Rime et prose, Napoli: 1616). See also G. B. Basile, Osservationi intorno alle rime del Bembo, e del Caso, con la tavola delle desinenze delle rime, et con la varietà de' testi nelle rime del Bembo (Napoli: 1618). Udeno Nisieli (i.e. Benedetto Fioretti), Proginnasmi poetici (5 vols. Firenze: 1620–39): through the mass

of short dissertations the student must hunt for what concerns him. He will find some guidance in the indexes and in Blankenburg. The essays are full of quotations, and for this reason are often helpful as a guide to other renaissance critics. We have not been able to find V. Galli's De lyric. poem. syntagma, etc. (Mediol.: 1626; see Blankenburg 2: 318), or F. Menini's Il ritratto del sonetto, e della canzone, discorsi (Napoli: 1677; cf. Idea del sonetto, Ven.: 1670; see Blankenburg, Index, and *Guardian*, No. 16). F. Querengo, Trattato della poesia (Padova: 1644). G. Batista, Poetica (Ven.: 1676). B. Menzini, Dell' Arte poetica (Firenze: 1688), Lib. III, IV, Dithyrambic and Sacred Poetry. See also the treatises on versification by Zuccolo (1623), Pietro della Valle (1634), Stigliani (1658), Salvadori (1691), and L. Mattei (1695), all mentioned by Blankenburg under the article *Vers*. For other Poetics of the century see Gayley and Scott as already indicated.

C. *The Eighteenth Century.*

On the general character of the Poetics of this century see C. Berardi, Per una storia della poetica nel settecento (in *Rassegna critica della letteratura italiana*, 15: 1–18. 1910). Note particularly what the author has to say of religious poetry in the Settecento. See also T. Concari, Il Settecento, Chaps. IV, V, IX; M. Landau, Gesch. der ital. Litt. im 18ten Jahrh. (Berlin: 1899), Pt. I; Vernon Lee, Studies of the 18th Cent. in Italy (Lond.: 1880); L. Collison-Morley, Modern Ital. Lit. (Lond.: 1911), Chap. V. Blankenburg, Gayley and Scott, and Saintsbury should be consulted as noted above.

Crescimbeni and Quadrio, both inclining to the historical method, and Baretti are the chief critics of this age. Crescimbeni's scattered utterances upon the lyric should be looked for in his Della bellezza della volgar poesia (Rome: 1700); Istor. della volgar poesia (1st ed. Rome: 1698; see vol. VI of the Venetian ed. of 1730), which contains notices of ancient and contemporary Italian poets; Vite degl' Arcadi Illustri (4 vols. Roma: 1708–27); and L' Arcadia (1711). Quadrio's remarkable Della storia e della ragione d' ogni poesia (1739) has been noted above (§ 2). Vol. II of this work forms the most ambitious of Italian works on the lyric. All of Lib. I, which forms the larger part of the volume (800 pp.), consists of brief notices of lyric authors of all ages and peoples (Distinzione I) and an account of hymnody and of the musical accompaniments of the ancients. In Lib. II (440 pp.) are long accounts of a great variety of lyric subtypes, ancient, medieval, and modern, with which, and the little concluding chapter on the general character of the lyric, the student of poetics will be especially concerned. M. G. Baretti's criticism is largely directed against the false poetic ideals of the Arcadians (see below, § 6, VIII, H). Indeed the storm-centre of the criticism of the century is this Arcadian Academy. Baretti's chief critical work is contained in his Fruta letteraria. L. A. Muratori's Della perfetta poesia italiana, spiegata e dimostrata (Modena: 1706) — pseudo-classical and Arcadian, relying on Aristotle and Horace, preferring didactic moralizing to lyrics of love — is typical of the critical temper of the 18th century. G. Gravina, Della ragion poetica (Roma: 1708, or 1704?); see Lib. I, Cap. xiii. P. J. Martelli, Della poetica, in Rime e prose (Roma: 1710). Scip. Maffei, Discours sur l'histoire et le genie des poëtes italiens (in Bibl. italique, 1: 223–278, 2: 176–324. Gen.: 1728). G. C. Becelli, Della novella poesia cioè del vero genere e particolari bellezze della poesia italiana libri tre (Verona: 1732), — an attempt to expound the nature of original Italian poetry as distinguished from Italian imitations of the ancients; in Lib. II the pure Italian lyric is differentiated from Greek and Latin lyrics (cf. Lib. I); the Pastoral is treated as a modern invention. F. Palesi, Della poetica libri tre (Palermo: 1734). G. Salio, Esame critico intorno a varie sentenze d' alcuni scrittori di cose poetiche (Pad.: 1738). S. Bettinelli's attacks on the Arcadian fashions of the day, and, indeed, upon all the ancient Italian poets, are contained in his Lettere dieci di Virgilio agli Arcadi (1757) and his Lettere inglesi; see also his Risorgimento negli studi, nelle arti e ne' costumi dopo il mille (1775–1786), in which is a sketch of the literary history of Italy. Bettinelli's Discorso sopra il sonetto (in Opere, vol. VI. Ven.: 1782) is a short preface to his own Sonetti, describing the genius of the type; see also the charming Delle lodi del Petrarca (Bassano: 1786). C. Denina, Saggio sopra la letteratura italiana (Tor.: 1762). F. M. Zanotti, Dell' Arte poetica, ragionamenti cinque, 5th Rag. (Bologna: 1768). G. Tiraboschi, Storia della letteratura itåliana (Mod.: 1771–82), with which monumental work we reach the historical school, though of course only the infancy of that school. Tiraboschi is a lumber-room of erudition; you often look in vain for independent criticism and historical generalization. G. de Coureil, Epist. sopra i poeti (in Opere. Firenze: 1790). G. B. Baldelli, Del Petrarca e delle sue opere (1797). Still other Poetics are cited by Gayley and Scott, pp. 447–448. On the Letters of Clementino Vannetti, especially the one bearing on Klopstock's Pindarics, see Concari, pp. 379–380. The literary periodicals of this age, modelled after *The Spectator*, should also be sifted for criticism (see Concari, Chap. V; Collison-Morley, 80–82).

D. *The Nineteenth Century.*

G. A. Borgese's Storia della critica romantica in Italia (Napoli: 1905) deals in a general way with the nature of Italian romantic criticism, and is valuable as a guide to the philosophical bases of this criticism. Saintsbury offers little aid, since he discusses one critic only, De Sanctis (Hist. Crit., 3: 588–591). L. Morandi's Antologia della nostra critica letteraria moderna (18th ed. Città di Castello: 1905) is useful principally as suggesting the chief critical works of the century, for the selections contain but little bearing upon the lyric. See also F. Flamini, Antologia della critica e dell' erudizione coordinata allo studio della storia letteraria ital. (Napoli: 1912), a most helpful work. Brief notices will also be found in Flamini's Compendio di storia della letteratura italiana (12th ed. Livorno: 1914), pp. 322–326, 392, and in Collison-Morley's Modern Italian Lit. (Lond.: 1911), Chaps. IX, XIII. For other aid the student must consult the histories of Italian literature, especially G. Mazzoni's L' Ottocento (Storia lett. d' Italia scritta da una soc. di professori). See Chaps. III, V, VI, VII, VIII, IX of this invaluable work and the corresponding sections of the bibliographical notes.

The poetics of Italian Romanticism is to be found in the four Sermoni sulla poesia (1818) of Giovanni Torti (1774–1852) printed in the *Conciliatore*, the organ of the Romanticists. Compare Giovanni Berchet's Sul cacciatore feroce e sulla Leonora di Goffredo Augusto Bürger, Lettera semiseria di Grisostonio; Carlo Porta's Il romanticismo; and Vincenzo Monti's defense of classicism in his Sulla mitologia (1825). The romantic movement in Italy was primarily of a political character; the original *tendenz* of the Milanese *Biblioteca Italiana* (first number, Jan. 1816), which was the first organ of Italian romanticism, was the creation in Lombardy of a pro-Austrian and pro-German sentiment. It was in this periodical that Madame de Staël sounded what was the clarion of Italian literary romanticism, the call to the Italians to desert phrase-making and classical pedantry and to turn to the study of modern ideas and contemporary foreign literature. And so it was that Torti and Berchet contended for a new poetry, of sincere and contemporary appeal, popular rather than classical, national rather than antique and pagan. Already the Germans had attained such a literature: let the Italians learn of them. Such ideas could never vitally affect a race with the classical heritage and instinct of the Italians. The chief romantic poet of Italy is Manzoni, and in his critical utterances (see the letter, Sul romanticismo, to Marchese Cesare d'Azeglio, written in 1823, and various fragments and passages in the Opere varie di Manzoni, 2d ed. Milano: 1870) the student will find much that is typical of the romantic trend. Indeed, from the general character of these and of the other references given above (see also Foscolo's essays), and from the actual practice of the Italian romanticists (see below, § 6, VIII, 1), the student must deduce the temper of the lyric criticism of this school.

But the greater part of the criticism of this century was in Italy, as elsewhere, primarily psychological or historical. The more psychological such criticism has been, the more speculative and theoretical has been its coloring: as such it is the characteristic form of nineteenth-century speculative criticism. Historical criticism, on the other hand, eschews theory, and therefore is discussed under another heading (see below, §§ 4, 5, 6). As a matter of fact the historical and psychological methods constantly overlap in practice. Therefore the student of theory must examine all the criticism of the century, both that which aims at history proper and also that which does not, with a view to separating the treatises and fragments of treatises that may properly be denominated 'theoretical.' This is a long and arduous task, not yet undertaken to any great extent. The most that can be done here is to offer the following suggestive list of the chief critics (for further notices of many of them see §§ 2, 5, 6; trace by Index): Tommasèo, Mazzini, Settembrini, De Sanctis (important; see his Petrarca, 1869, Leopardi, 1885, and the two series of critical essays), Villari, Ardito (especially his A. Poerio e le sue poesie. Napoli: 1878), Bartoli, Chiarini, Carducci (very important), Giovanni Mestica, Zumbini, De Gubernatis, Monaci, De Amicis, Graf, D' Ovidio, Torraca, B. Croce (important), Flamini, etc. The *Giornale storico della letteratura italiana* will give an excellent idea of the historical method as pursued by Italian critics.

IV. **French.**

A. *Fourteenth and Fifteenth Centuries.*

On this period see Saintsbury, Hist. Crit., vol. II, Book IV, Chap. IV, pp. 109–110; Gayley and Scott, pp. 428–429; Petit de Julleville, II, 392. The chief studies of early French criticism have been made by E. Langlois: see his De artibus rhetoricae rhythmicae, sive de artibus poeticis in Francia ante litterarum renovationem editis, etc. (Paris: 1890), and the introduction and notes to his Recueil d'arts de seconde rhétorique (Collection de documents inédits sur l'histoire de France publiés par les soins du Ministre de l'instruction publique. Paris: 1902).

The beginnings of French criticism in the vernacular consist of a number of treatises devoted primarily to the versification of early fixed and complicated forms of the lyric, such as ballade, virelai, rondeau, chant royal, sirvente, etc. Little attempt is made to discuss the nature of poetry and its kinds: sometimes the author definitely points out that he is only imparting rules for the external forms of poetry, whereas the originating poetic power is a gift of nature that cannot be handed down by precept and measure (see Langlois, Recueil, vii ff.). These treatises are usually subsumed under the head of Rhetoric, and are often said to belong to the *Seconde Rhétorique* because the "first deals with prose." Eustache Deschamps heads the list with his L'Art de dictier et de fere chançons, balades, virelais et rondeaulx, etc., 1392 (in vol. VII of the Œuvres complètes, ed. Queux de Saint Hilaire et G. Raynaud, 11 vols., Paris: 1878–1900, Soc. des anc. textes français; on possible sources, see vol. XI, p. 155). It is noticeable that he places his work under music rather than rhetoric. Cf. E. Hoeppner, Eust. Deschamps (Strassburg: 1904). The first five of the works edited by Langlois (Recueil, etc.) belong to the fifteenth century. The title of the second, by an anonymous writer, is descriptive of all: "Les règles de la seconde rhétorique, c'est assavoir des choses rimées, lesquelles sont de pluseurs tailles et de pluseurs fachons, sy comme lais, chans royaux, diz, serventois, amoureuses, balades, rondeaux, virelais, rotuenges, sotes chansons, etc." — The study of these works should be supplemented by a view of contemporary Latin treatises on versification. What interrelation can be discovered? See G. Mari, I trattati medievali di ritmica latina (Milan: 1899).

For an example of a troubadour's comment on his own (Provençal) art, see the 13th century Las rasos de trobar of the Catalonian Raimon Vidal of Besadun (F. Guessard, Grammaires provençales, Paris: 1858; E. Stengel, Die beiden ältesten prov. Gram., Marburg: 1878; Chaytor, The Troubadours, p. 122).

B. *Sixteenth Century.*

For the general trend of criticism in this period see Gayley and Scott, pp. 429–432; Spingarn, Lit. Crit. in Renaissance, Part Second; Brunetière, L'Évolution des genres, etc., vol. I L'Évolution de la critique depuis la Renaissance jusqu'a nos jours, Chap. I (3d ed. Paris: 1898) — see the admirable summary of French criticism on pp. 14–18, which has been translated by Professor Cook (The Art of Poetry, p. li ff.); Saintsbury, Hist. Crit., vol. II, Book IV, Chap. IV. For critical apparatus concerning the earlier rhetorics see above under A, to which should be added H. Zschalig, Die Verslehren von Fabri, du Pont und Sibilet (Diss. inaug. Heidelberg. Leipz.: 1884). On the criticism of the Pléiade see the general references just mentioned and the following: Brunetière, La Pléiade française (in *Rev. des Deux Mondes*, Dec. 15, 1900, Jan. 1 and Feb. 1, 1901); Darmesteter et Hatzfeld, Le seizième siècle en France, Paris: 1878; E. Egger, L'Hellénisme en France (2 vols., Paris: 1869), XVII^e^ Leçon, L'Épopée française au 16^e^ siècle; E. Langlois, De Artibus Rhetoricae Rythmicae (Paris: 1890); Marty-Laveaux, La Pléiade françoise (ed. of works, with biographies, etc.); G. Pellissier, De Sexti Decimi Saeculi in Francia Artibus Poeticis (Paris: 1883); by the same, the Introduction to his ed. of L'Art Poétique of Vauquelin de la Fresnaye (Paris: 1885); L. Petit de Julleville, Hist. de la langue et de la litt. fr. (Paris: 1896), vol. II, p. 392; A. Rosenbauer, Die poet. Theorien d. Plejade nach Ronsard, etc. (in *Münchener Beitr. z. roman. u. engl. Philol.*, N. 10, 1895); T. Rücktäschl, Einige Arts poétiques aus der Zeit Ronsards und Malherbe (Leipz.: 1889); C. A. Sainte-Beuve, Tableau historique et critique de la poésie française au 16^e^ siècle (Paris: 1828); J. B. Fletcher, Areopagus and Pléiade (in *Journal of Germanic Philology*, 1899, vol. II). For the Pléiade's renovation of the lyric, epic, and drama, see Pellissier's Vauquelin, Introd., lvii–lxix, and compare xxvii. Rücktäschl gives (p. 5) a bibliography of works treating of the poetics of this period, and (pp. 5–7) a bibliography of the poetics themselves. See also É. Faguet, Seizième siècle. Études littéraires (1894).

Blankenburg and Quadrio, as noted above, § 2, are extremely useful in supplying bibliography of the criticism of the 16th–18th centuries.

During the first half of this century the rhetorical treatises on old French lyric versification continue, and are then succeeded by the classical influence of the Pléiade, while Sibilet's Art poétique (1548) makes the transition from the one to the other. To the works on prosody belong the last two anonymous treatises edited by Langlois (Recueil, etc.); the Instructif de la seconde rhétorique, or Jardin de plaisancy, of the anonymous Infortuné (1500 c.); Pierre Fabri's Grand et vrai art de pleine rhétorique (1521. Ed. with introd. by A. Héron. 3 vols., Rouen: 1889–90, Soc. des Bibliophiles Normands); Gratien du Pont's Art et science de rhétorique metrifiée (1539); and others mentioned in Langlois' De Artibus Rhet. (*op. cit. supra*.). See also Geoffroy Tory's Champfleury (1529) and Marot's introductory remarks to his edition of Villon (1533): cf. Saintsbury, Hist. Crit., II, p. 110, Note 4.

Sibilet's Art poétique, written the year before Du Bellay started the classical reaction (see below), is noteworthy because although it gives the usual rules for the older French forms it makes mention also of epigram, sonnet, ode, elegy, and eclogue, and takes into view the medieval morality and farce. Thus it is a connecting link between the old *Seconde Rhétorique* and the Renaissance criticism of the Pléiade. Sibilet anticipates many of the ideas of the Pléiade, but he still holds to Clément Marot and the latter's followers as poetic models.

The student will find that much of the discussion aroused by the Pléiade, and by the followers of Malherbe, turns upon the *épisseries* of the Middle Ages. Following Scaliger, the poets of the Pléiade praised the ode at the expense of the old French lyric forms, such as the "rondeaux, ballades, vyrelaiz, chants royaux, chansons et autres telles *épisseries* qui corrumpent le goust de notre langue" (Du Bellay). Much also is made of the sonnet as a desirable lyric form. The question of propriety in poetic diction was also a major topic with the new school. Though this consideration underlies of course the study of all poetic kinds, it may be conveniently developed in connection with the lyric. Concerning lyric theory proper there is nothing in this century; only a very few titles of contemporary works lay any emphasis upon the lyric. See T. Rücktäschl, pp. 17–28; G. Pellissier, L'Art poétique de Vauquelin de la Fresnaye, pp. XV–XVI, XXVI, L ff., and by the same author, De Sexti Decimi Saeculi in Francia Artibus Poeticis, pp. 34–36, 72–88, etc.; A. Rosenbauer, Chap. III; and P. Villey, Les sources italiennes de la "Defense et illustration de la langue française" (vol. IX of the *Bibliothèque de la Renaissance*, ed. P. De Nolhac and L. Dorez, Paris: 1909). In studying the criticism of this school the student should note the influence of Aristotle, Vida, Minturno, and Scaliger, but especially that of Horace.

J. Du Bellay, one of the chief spokesmen of the Pléiade, bears witness to the general eagerness to substitute imitations of the classics for the old native forms. The poet, according to Du Bellay's rules, should cultivate the epic, the Sophoclean tragedy, Horatian satire, the epigram of Martial, the elegies of Ovid, Tibullus, and Propertius, and the Italian sonnet (Prefaces to the Vers lyriques, and to the first and second editions of L'Olive, 1549–50; La défense et illustration de la langue françoise, 1549, Chap. IV). For a reply to Du Bellay, a defense of Villon and the old lyric forms, and a witless attack on sonnet and elegy, see Aneau's Le Quintil Horatien (Saintsbury, Hist. Crit., II, 116–117). Du Bellay's attacks upon Sibilet and the school of Marot were answered by Sibilet in the preface to his translation (1549) of the Iphigenia of Euripides and by Guillaume des Autels in his Réplique aux furieuses défenses de Louis Meigret (Lyons: 1550). Du Bellay's reply consists of the preface to the second edition (1550) of his Olive and of two satirical poems (Musagnaeomachie and Contre les envieux poètes) published along with the Olive sonnets. J. Pelletier's Art poétique, breathing the new spirit, appeared in 1555. See L. M. Gay, Sources of the Académie de l'Art Poëtique of Pierre de Deimier: Pelletier du Mans (*Pub. Mod. Lang. Ass.*, XXVII, 1912). Ronsard, the head of the Pléiade, was interested, like his followers, in the musical, or lyrical, effects of verse. He made much of the Pindaric ode, which he (erroneously) said he had introduced into France, and the true nature of which he understood as little as did the other Pindaric innovators of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. For references, see below, § 6, VII, G; and add the important work by P. Laumonier, Ronsard, Poète lyrique (Paris: 1909), where will be found an extended discussion of Ronsard's Odes, and of his relation to the lyric poets of his own time as well as to the French lyric in general; see also H. Chamard, L'Invention de l'ode et le différend de Ronsard et Du Bellay (in *Rev. d'hist. litt. de la Fr.*, 1889, pp. 21–54); and, in general, works on Ronsard and Du Bellay. The student may also consider Laudun d'Aigaliers (L'Art poétique français, 1598), who commented on ode, virelay, lay, cantique, sonnet, etc., and invented a demi-sonnet. The final Poetics of the

Pléiade was written by Vauquelin de la Fresnaye (Art poétique, 1605, ed. G. Pellissier, as noted above; see Index under élégie, ode, sonnet, etc.): see the first book for opposition to the *épisseries* and for praise of the sonnet; the second book for notices of French lyric poets and further praise of classic forms; the third book for pastoral and minor kinds.

On the influence of François de Malherbe, 1558–1628, who led the reaction against the uncritical innovations of the Pléiade, and gave an impress to the Classical Period of French poetics by means of his formalistic example, see Gayley and Scott, pp. 431–434 and the references there cited. He devoted himself to the further elaboration of the lyric, but he rationalized "feeling" out of it and substituted the oratory of the ode. May Malherbe's criticism be regarded as descending from older writers, especially Pelletier du Mans? See F. Brunot, La doctrine de Malherbe (Paris: 1891), and the article by L. M. Gay, noted above.

C. *Seventeenth Century.*

On the general trend of poetics in this period see Gayley and Scott, pp. 431–436; Brunetière, L'Évolution des genres, etc., vol. I L'Évolution de la critique depuis la Renaissance jusqu'à nos jours, pp. 14–16 and Chaps. II–IV (3d ed. Paris: 1898); Saintsbury, Hist. Crit., vol. II, Bk. V, Chap. I; A. Bourgoin, Les maîtres de la critique au XVII^{e} siècle (Paris: 1889; Chapelain, Saint-Évremond, Boileau, La Bruyère, Fénelon); F. Vial and L. Denise, Idées et doctrines littéraires du XVII^{e} siècle (Paris: 1906). Quadrio and Blankenburg have been mentioned above. On the "Ancient and Modern Quarrel" see Gayley and Scott, 405–406, 435; Rigault, as mentioned below, § 8; Brunetière, *op. cit.*, Chap. IV.

All seventeenth-century, and most eighteenth-century, criticism of the lyric is dominated by attention to the pseudo-classical ode, and, in less degree, the sonnet. The nature of this preoccupation is of the narrow, rule-giving sort, and the rules are in themselves conventionally superficial and trite. Boileau's criticism is of course typical. In his Art poétique (1674) and his Discours sur l'ode (1693) he rings the changes on the striking, impetuous, sublime character and *beau désordre* of the ode, and upon the inspired nature of the Pindaric poet, who is guided more by the *démon* of poetry than by reason. But beyond a few glowing phrases in commendation of the form, and a few manly expostulations with the smooth imitators of Tibullus, there is little to guide the historian save detailed analyses and appreciations of diction, figures, and the like,—which apply to poetry in general and tell nothing of the inner nature of the lyric as a distinctive type. Cf. S. J. Delaporte, L'Art poétique de Boileau commenté par ses contemporains (Lille: 1888); for references on Boileau see below, § 8. This is the century of the Ancient and Modern Quarrel, and of course the lyric was occasionally mentioned in this battle of books. In Boileau's Réflexions critiques sur . . . Longin will be found a defense of Pindar against the assaults of the modern, Perrault, along with Perrault's answer (Œuvres de Boileau, 4 vols. Amsterdam: 1735. Vol. III). But the main business of seventeenth-century criticism was with the epic and drama. The position of the lyric may well be inferred from the small place given to it by Fontenelle in his Description de l'empire de la poésie (1678). La Fontaine, in his Épître à Huet, 1687, observes: "L'ode qui baisse un peu / Veut de la patience, et nos gens ont du feu." The student should also consider the preciosity-quarrel begun by Voiture's sonnet to Uranie; in which connection see Balzac, Remarques sur les deux sonnets d'Uranie et de Job (Œuvres. 1665. Vol. II). Other typical material may be found in A. Dacier's Remarques critiques sur les œuvres d'Horace, avec une nouvelle traduction (7 vols. Paris: 1683–1697). See also Madame Dacier's translation of Anacreon and Sappho (1681).

D. *Eighteenth Century.*

On the general trend of criticism see Gayley and Scott, pp. 436–439; Brunetière, L'Évolution des genres, etc., vol. I L'Évolution de la critique depuis la Renaissance jusqu'a nos jours, Chap. V (3d ed. Paris: 1898); Saintsbury, Hist. Crit., vol. II, Bk. V, Chap. I, and Bk. VI, Chap. II, and vol. III, Bk. VII, Chap. IV; É. Faguet, Dix-huitième siècle, etc.

(7th ed. Paris: 1890); É. Egger, L'Hellénisme en France (2 vols. Paris: 1869); Quadrio and Blankenburg, as noted above, § 2. From the last two, especially the latter, may be exhumed the titles of treatises all but forgotten. Another useful guide is Vial et Denise, Idées et doctrines littéraires du XVIII^e siècle (Paris: 1909).

Boileau's estimate of the ode persists with but slight modification. The critics of the century are almost a unit in their praise of the ode as specifically the poem of genius and inspiration, and in meticulously insisting that the inspirational enthusiasm must after all be a reasonable enthusiasm. The *beau désordre* must in itself be the effect of a hidden plan. Houdar de Lamotte finds inspiration a sufficient definition of lyric enthusiasm. It remained for another century to inaugurate a new epoch of lyric criticism by regarding this rather mythical 'inspiration' more wisely and analyzing it as a subjective phenomenon. Lamotte expatiates upon the sublimity of diction and subject necessary to the ode; of the *beau désordre* he writes: "J'entends par ce beau désordre, une suite de pensées liées entre elles par un rapport commun à la même matière, mais affranchies des liaisons grammaticales et de ces transitions scrupuleuses qui énervent la poésie lyrique et lui font perdre même toute sa grâce" (Discours sur la poésie en général et sur l'ode en particulier, in Les Odes, 1707; this Discours and the Réponse à M. Despréaux may be found in B. Jullien, Les Paradoxes littéraires de Lamotte, etc., Paris: 1859, pp. 78–120; see also the Odes et autres ouvrages, 1711, — L'Enthousiasme, vol. II; also, L'Ode de M. de la Faille mise en prose, in Œuvres de théâtre, vol. II, 1730; cf. below, § 9, VI, C). J. B. Rousseau regards the ode as "le véritable champ du sublime et du pathétique, qui sont les deux grands ressorts de la poésie," and cites the Psalms of David as the noblest examples of this sublimity (Œuvres Diverses. 1712. Préface). Montesquieu, the literary nonconformist, is unique in his scorn of the lyric as "une harmonieuse extravagance" (cf. below, § 9, VI, C, Dargan, p. 107). E. Lebrun insists upon the necessity of genius (Réflexions sur le génie de l'ode. 1736). See also Antoine Godeau on the Ode (in the Bibliothèque

Poëtique, etc., Ed., A. C. Lefort de la Marinière, 4 vols. 1745). L. J. B. Mancini-Mazarini, duc de Nivernais, in 1743 wrote a dissertation on the elegy (Ed., Didot, II, 259–290), discussing Boileau's definition of this genre, limiting the elegy to erotic subjects, inveighing against funereal subjects, recognizing the elegiacal in the troubadours, and preferring Tibullus to Ovid. Compare the article on Tibullus by Lebrun-Pindare, 1763 (Œuv. Comp. IV, 394–395), and an Essai sur la poésie érotique, published in 1780, with the Les Amours, Élég. en III livres of Flies des Oliviers. Vauvenargues calls the ode "une espèce de délire" (Œuvres, Ed., D. L. Gilbert, 1857, pp. 279–280; cf. Gilbert's note, p. 157). Le Franc de Pompignan has something to say on the beauty of rhyme and harmony in the ode, — rhyme being an adornment to the ode commonly insisted upon at this time (Discours prononcé dans l'Académie de Montauban, le 25 août, 1747). D'Alembert is not satisfied with the ordinary "rules" for the ode, — the usual desiderata, such as inspiration and sublimity. There are successful odes of many and even opposite kinds, he says: the one great rule, "c'est de n'être ni froids ni ennuyeux" (Réflexions sur la poésie, 1760, and Réflexions sur l'ode, 1762, — both in the Œuvres philosophiques, historiques et littéraires, 18 vols., Paris: 1805, vol. IV). J. B. Gossart's Discours sur la poésie lyrique, avec les modéles du genre, tirés de Pindare, d'Anacréon, de Sappho, etc., was published in 1761. The author would lay down the rules of the Pindaric ode, not in order to make poets but to show young people how the great writers of odes have gone to work. Two sorts of odes are noted, the anacreontic and the philosophical. Without genius, no Pindarics! But this genius must be regulated by art, and this regulation pertains to the arrangement of the parts of the ode, and to the nature and rendering of thought and feeling. The work is a good example of formal criticism. In 1763 appeared M. A. Bouchard's Essai sur la poésie rhythmique. Voltaire regards the ode as consecrated to *Exagération*. Consider his statement: "Aussi plus une nation devient philosophe, plus les odes à enthousiasme, et qui n'apprennent rien aux hommes, perdent de leur prix" (Dictionnaire Philosophique, 1764, Art. Exagération; see also the articles on art, poetry, literature, song, enthusiasm, and allied topics). F. J. de Chastellux's Essai sur l'union de la poésie et de la musique belongs to the year 1765; see p. 161 ff. for an example of the confusion of poetry and music. In vol. XII, 1765, of the Encyclopédie will be found an article on the Poème Lyrique; the articles dealing with the Ode are in vols. IX and XI, 1765; and in the Suppl. vol. IV, 1777. See J. Rocafort, Des doctrines littéraires de l'Encyclopédie, p. 154 ff., chiefly on the ode (Paris: 1890). Diderot's Réflexions sur l'ode belong to 1770. The author explains that the ode is a rare form because it presupposes in the poet two almost incompatible qualities: "un profond jugement dans l'ordonnance, et une muse violente dans l'exécution." Cf. J. M. B. Clément's Lettres à M. de Voltaire (4 vols., 1773–76). Marmontel has little theory in his article Lyrique, but a comparatively full account of the ode will be found in the article devoted to it; see also Hymne and Chanson (Éléments de littérature, 6 vols., 1787, — a reprint of earlier articles contributed to the Encyclopédie). See also an essay by J. F. de La Harpe, De la poésie lyrique des Anciens et des Modernes (in *Mercure*, April, 1772, and vol. IV of the author's Œuvres, 6 vols., Paris: 1779). To this century belongs also the Poëme de l'Invention of André de Chénier, though it was not published till later; its text is in the verse "Sur de pensers nouveaux faisons des vers antiques." Other essays on the ode by Charl. Roy, Remond de St. Mard, Sabatier, Val. de Rehengac, and Domairon, mentioned by Blankenburg 2: 430, we have not been able to consult.

E. *The Nineteenth Century.*

On the general critical trend of the period see Gayley and Scott, pp. 439–445. See especially Saintsbury's Hist. of Crit., vol. III; Babbitt's Masters of Modern French Criticism (Boston and N.Y.: 1912); Brunetière's L'Évolution de la critique, etc.; and Pellissier's Lit. Movement in France during the 19th Century (Eng. trans., N.Y. and Lond.:

1897). A. F. Michiels' Hist. des idées litt. en France au XIX^e siècle, etc. (3d ed. 2 vols. Bruxelles: 1848) is a very readable work, distinguished by the breadth and inspiration of the author's view of literary development. For lists of critics of the period see p. 395 ff. of Babbitt's work just mentioned; the bibliographical sections of A. van Bever and P. Léautaud, Poètes d'aujourd'hui 1880–1900 (19th ed. 2 vols. Paris: 1908), and G. Walch, Anthologie des poètes français contemporains 1866–1906 (3 vols. Paris: 1906–07); the footnotes in Brunetière's L'Évolution de la poésie lyrique en France au 19^e siècle (2d ed. 2 vols. Paris: 1895). Further aid in constructing such lists is offered by the works cited by Gayley and Scott, pp. 77–78, 439–445. In general, the student will naturally turn to works and articles dealing with the chief lyrists of the time, such as André Chénier, Lamartine, Hugo, Alfred de Musset, Alfred de Vigny, Gautier, Leconte de Lisle, Heredia, Prudhomme, Coppée, Henri de Régnier, Paul Verlaine, and others.

The development of French criticism in general during this century is characterized by a liberation from the negative 'rules' of the previous age, due to the romantic fecundation of mind and emotion; and by the advent of the scientific-historical method.

Rousseau, Bernardin de Saint-Pierre, and Chateaubriand, in the previous century and the beginning of this, were largely responsible for the spirit of liberation that eventually broke down the 'rule' system of poetics; but Madame de Staël expressed with no less force and with a deeper realization of the relativity of literature to history, environment, and race, the protest against the former negative system. In her De l'Allemagne (see below) she makes this protest in the name of the northern literatures. The student should study her utterances to determine their affinity with lyric idealism as well as their actual contribution to the theory of a free and natural lyricism. Under the romanticists the personal character of the lyric is developed in practice and is critically recognized as a distinguishing feature of the type; henceforth the term 'lyric' is almost synonymous with poetic inspiration, with spontaneity of emotional and imaginative genius (cf. Jouffroy, above, § 2). La Harpe has been called a precursor of the historical method of criticism,—of criticism that seeks to relate an author's work to his environment, to find a key to his work in the movements of his time, to study the individual author in his social relations. But La Harpe was much of a formalist. In this century, however, Villemain, Sainte-Beuve, Taine, Brunetière, and a host of others undertook this species of evaluation; and by far the greater amount of the criticism — learned and other — of the present day is of this sort. Such studies must be considered in later sections, under the history of the lyric (§§ 4–6). Incidental, however, to the general historical aim there occur, of course, many statements of a theoretical nature, to be gathered from the mass of historical essays, — a task by no means light, and, once performed, redundant with results fragmentary and unsystematic in character. Below are suggested a few of the more general treatises available for this purpose. In § 6, VII, J the student will find a list of works dealing primarily with particular lyric poets of this age. The scarcity of works devoted wholly to the theory of the lyric is noteworthy, and stands in contrast to the fullness of the lyric expression of the century. Such works have already been noted (§ 2).

But while the scientific-historical movement has dominated the poetics of the second half of the nineteenth and the opening years of the twentieth century, it has had many ramifications and kinds; and each succeeding wave of literary fashion has been represented by new variations in criticism. The influence of the Parnassians and Naturalists, the classical reactionaries, the Symbolists and Décadents, upon lyric theory yet remains to be assayed (compare Brunetière, L'Évolution de la poésie lyrique, etc., vol. I, Chaps. i, iv, viii; II, xii, xv). The turning of criticism into literary psychology (see, e.g., Bourget and Faguet) is a particularly interesting departure, and one that may throw much light on the nature of the lyric. The pseudo-scientific theories of Hennequin, Texte's "revival of the comparative or cosmopolitan idea advocated by Rousseau, and adopted by Madame de Staël," Tarde's expansion of the laws of imitation, and many other more or less scientific and historical methods deserve careful consideration with a view to their applicability to the study of the lyric. In many cases the student will have to make the application for himself, since there has often been a failure to substantiate theory by analysis and illustration in the concrete. Indeed, in some of the more general works listed below there is but slight reference to the lyric, and occasionally nothing that would at first blush appear to bear specifically upon the poetics of the type.

The following references are by no means exhaustive. — Madame de Staël, De la littérature, etc. (2 vols. 1800), De l'Allemagne (1810, 1813), — *passim*, and II Chap. X in the latter. V. Hugo, prefaces to the various editions of Odes et Ballades (1822, '24, '26, '28, '53). C. H. Millevoye, in a Discours sur l'élégie which was first printed by his editors in 1822, submits the opinion that the elegy corresponds to a universal human need, viz., melancholy, solitude, *tendresse*, and so is always found to exist; but what constitutes its essence is not always found in so-called 'elegies,' and, on the other hand, its essence is not seldom present in poems that are not classed as elegies. J. J. Ampère, De l'hist. de la poésie (1830), and many other historical works. Mgr. Cruice, Études litt. sur l'apologue, la poésie lyrique, la poésie épique chez les Français, les Anglais, les Allemands, les Italiens et les Espagnols, et sur la poésie hébraïque et la poésie orientale (Paris: 1840). A. Lamartine, Des destinées de la poésie (1834), Cours familier de litt. (28 vols. 1856–69). P. B. de Barante, Mélanges (3 vols. 1835), Études (1858). G. Planche, Portraits littéraires (2 vols. 1836), Nouveaux portraits litt. (2 vols. 1854), etc. D. Nisard, Hist. de la litt. française (4 vols. 1844–61), Études sur la renaissance (1855), Études de critique littéraire (1858), Études d'histoire et de litt. (1859), Nouvelles études, etc. (1864), Mélanges, etc. (1868), Nouveaux mélanges, etc. (1886), Portraits et études d'hist. litt. (1874), Essais sur l'école romantique (1891). Nisard represents a reaction against the liberal movement: he is "idealistic and didactic" in method. H. Blaze de Bury, Les écrivains et poètes modernes de l'Allemagne (2 vols. 1846), Les écrivains modernes de l'Allemagne (1868). V. de Laprade, Le génie littéraire de la France (1848), Hist. du sentiment de la nature (1883), etc. A. R. Vinet, Études sur la litt. fr. au xix^{e} siècle (3 vols. 1849), etc. A. A. Cuvellier-Fleury, various studies. A. de Pontmartin, Causeries littéraires (1854), and a long list of Causeries litt. and Semaines litt. J. Janin, Critiques, portraits et caractères contemporains (1859), Œuvres Diverses (12 vols. 1876–78), etc. A. F. Villemain, Essais sur le génie de Pindare et sur la poésie lyrique (1859) — see also incidental references to lyric in his Cours de litt. fr. (6 vols. 1840–46), and in other works. J. A. Barbey D'Aurevilly, Les œuvres et les hommes du xix^e siècle (17 vols. 1861–99). A. F. Nettement, Poètes et artistes contemporains (1862). H. A. Taine, Hist. de la litt. anglaise (5 vols. 1863–67). E. H. A. Scherer, Études critiques sur la litt. contemporaine (10 vols. 1863–95), Études sur la litt. au xviii^e siècle (1891). P. Albert, La Poésie (Paris: 1869; 11^e ed., 1907), p. 147 ff., — a popular and superficial account of the chief lyric periods and poets; other works by the same author. P. Gaudin, Du Rondeau, du Triolet, du Sonnet (Paris: 1870). E. M. Caro, articles on the relation of modern science and philosophy to poetry (*Rev. d. D. Mondes*, 1874, 1878). T. Gautier, Portraits et souvenirs littéraires (1875), Hist. du romantisme (1874), Portraits contemporains (1874). R. G. E. Taillandier, Les destinées de la nouvelle poésie provençale (1876). A. Croiset, La poésie de Pindare et les lois du lyrisme Grec (1880). F. Brunetière, Études critiques (8 vols. 1880–1907), Histoire et littérature (3 vols. 1884–86), Questions de critique (1889), Nouvelles questions de critique (1890), L'Évolution des genres, l'évolution de la critique (1890), L'Évolution de la poésie lyrique en France au xix^e siècle (2 vols. 1894), Essais sur la litt. contemporaine (1892), Nouveaux essais (1895), Manuel de l'hist. de la litt. fr. (1897), Hist. de la litt. fr. classique (2 vols. 1905). P. Bourget, Essais de psychologie contemporaine (1883), Nouveaux essais (1885); Études et portraits (2 vols. 1888, 3d vol., 1906), Pages de critique et de doctrine (1912). E. Montégut, Nos morts contemporains (2 vols. 1883–84), and various works on contemporary French literature. É. Faguet, Les grands maîtres au xvii^e siècle (1885), Études litt. du xix^e siècle (1887), Études litt. du xvii^e siècle (1890), Études litt. du xvi^e siècle (1893). J. Lemaître, Les Contemporains (7 vols. 1885–99). E. Biré, Portraits litt. (1888), Causeries litt. (1889), etc., etc., including works on Victor Hugo, as noted below, § 6, VII, J. A. France, La vie littéraire (4 vols. 1888–94), etc. É. Rod, Études sur le xix^e siècle (1888), etc. G. Renard, Les princes de la jeune critique (1890), Critique de combat (3 vols. 1894–97), etc. G. Pellissier, Le mouvement littéraire au xix^e siècle (1889), Essais de litt. contemporaine (1893), Nouveaux essais, etc. (1895), Études de litt. contemp. (1898), Le mouvement litt. contemp. (1901), Études de litt. et de morale contemp. (1905), Le réalisme du romantisme (1912). J. Combarieu, Théories du rythme, etc. (Paris: 1897), with which compare the same author's Les rapports de la musique et de la poésie, etc. (Paris: 1894). R. Doumic, La Poétique nouvelle, in Les Jeunes (Paris: 1896), — idealism and dreams at the base of the new poetics, in a word, symbolism. J. Texte, Études de litt. européenne (Paris: 1898). R. de Sousa, La poésie populaire et le lyrisme sentimental (2d ed. Paris: 1899), a rather feverish defense of present-day French lyric poetry (Lyrisme sentimental); the author maintains that this poetry is thoroughly natural in its impulse and expression, and that therein it is similar to popular poetry. Sully Prudhomme, Testament poétique (Paris: 1901), a collection of utterances of various dates, giving expression to a present-day conception of the nature and function of poetry, with many statements bearing upon the lyric. R. Doumic, Hommes et idées du xix^e siècle (1903). See also the French critics of this period as cited above, § 2, and below, §§ 5, 6.

V. **English.**

For general reviews of English criticism see Gayley and Scott, pp. 383–422; Saintsbury's Hist. of Crit. (3 vols.), Hist. of English Criticism (Lond.: 1911) — a separate reprint of the chapters on English criticism in the larger Hist. of Crit.; Vaughan's English Literary Criticism (Lond.: 1896); L. J. Wylie's Studies in the Evolution of English Criticism (Boston: 1894); R. P. Cowl, The Theory of Poetry in England, 16th to 19th centuries (Lond.: 1914); G. M. Miller, The Historical Point of View in English Literary Criticism from 1570–1770 (in *Anglistische Forschungen*, No. 35. 1913).

A. *Sixteenth Century.*

For Renaissance and Elizabethan criticism see Gayley and Scott, p. 383 ff., 496 ff.; Saintsbury, Hist. Crit., vol. II, Bk. IV, Chap. V; J. F. Spingarn, Hist. Lit. Crit. in Renaissance (N.Y.: 1899), p. 253 ff.; F. E. Schelling, Poetic and Verse Criticism of the Reign of Elizabeth (Philadelphia: 1891); G. A. Thompson, Elizabethan Criticism of Poetry (Diss., Univ. of Chicago, Menasha, Wis.: 1914); J. Routh, The Classical Rule of Law in Eng. Crit. of the 16th and 17th Cents. (in *Jr. Eng. and Germ. Phil.*, 12: 612. 1913); P. Sheavyn, The Literary Profession in the Elizabethan Age (Manchester: 1909). See also Blankenburg, as noted above, § 2. — Many of the texts may be found in: J. Haslewood's Ancient Critical Essays upon English Poets and Poesy (2 vols. Lond.: 1811–15); G. G. Smith's Elizabethan Critical Essays (2 vols. Oxford: 1904); Arber's Reprints; Egerton Brydges' Censuria Literaria.

Elizabethan usage of the term 'lyric' always connotes musical quality or accompaniment, not subjective quality. Notices of the type are few, naïve, and mostly abusive or defensive. Ascham

(The Schoolmaster, 1570; see Smith, Elizabethan Critical Essays, vol. I, p. 23) notes melic poetry as the fourth kind of poetry. George Gascoigne (Certaine Notes of Instruction, in the Posies of George Gascoigne, etc., 1575; see Smith, vol. I) has some brief notes on rhyme royal, ballade, sonnet, etc.; cf. Schelling's essay on Gascoigne, mentioned elsewhere. The Letters of Spenser and Gabriel Harvey on Reformed Versifying, etc., 1579–80, are reprinted by Smith. For Sir Philip Sidney, see below, § 4. William Webbe criticizes severely makers of ballads, ale-house songs, sonnets, and "potticall" poets in general (A Discourse of English Poetrie, 1586); and similar to this abuse of the popular lyric is a passage by Thomas Nash on songs, sonnets, and the "rednose Fidler" (see the abstract from The Anatomie of Absurdity, 1589, in Smith, I, 321 ff.). The student should notice the confusion in these extracts of the sonnet with ale-house songs; it is a part of the critical confusion of the time. Puttenham mentions the lyric as a song intended to be sung with musical accompaniment, and believes that "hymnes to the gods was the first forme of Poesie and the highest and the statliest, and they were sung by the Poets as priests, and by the people or whole congregation, as we sing in our Churches the Psalmes of Dauid, but they did it commonly in some shadie groues of tall tymber trees" (The Arte of English Poesie, 1589, Lib. I, Chaps. XI–XII; see Smith, II, 26–31). Throughout the three books of the Arte are scattered brief references to "odes, songs, elegies, ballads, sonets and other ditties," to encomia, epithalamies, genethliaca, epitaphs, epigrams, etc. (see especially the enumeration of kinds in the last sixteen chapters of Lib. I); the note on Ronsard's Pindarics and the English translation of them (Lib. III, Chap. XXII) is of historical interest. Bishop Joseph Hall satirizes "the false and foolish compliments of the sonnet writer" (Virgidemiarum, 1597–98; see Bk. I, No. vii). Meres, 1598, informs us (Smith, II, 319) that the best English lyric poets are said to be Spenser, Daniel, Drayton, Shakespeare, Breton. The critical notices are as meagre as the poetry is plentiful!

B. *Seventeenth Century.*

On 17th century criticism see Gayley and Scott, p. 392 ff.; Saintsbury, Hist. Crit., vol. III, Bk. VII, Chap. III; J. E. Spingarn, Critical Essays of the 17th Century (3 vols. Oxford: 1908–1909; see the Introd. to vol. I); P. Hamelius, Die Kritik in der englischen Lit. d. 17. u. 18. Jahrhs. (Leipz.: 1897); Routh, Wylie, Vaughan, and Blankenburg as noted above. — The texts will be found for the most part in Spingarn's work, as just noted.

In view of the richness of the lyric production of this century, the paucity of lyric criticism is noticeable. The greatest critic of the period, Dryden, has very little to say concerning the type, and that of no moment (see Works, Ed. by Malone, II, 46–50, and cf. F. E. Schelling, Seventeenth Century Lyrics, pp. xxv–xxvi). In critical estimation the lyric is always subordinated to the other kinds; indeed, it is hardly recognized as a sort to be taken account of in distinction from epic and drama. Personal subjectivity is not yet realized as a lyric trait, and what distinction there is, is made according to subject matter. Scaliger affords the critical bases, and Horace is regarded as the lyrist *par excellence.* All notices are very brief. Thomas Campion indites the following: "Ditties or Odes; which we may call Lyricall, because thay are apt to be sung to an instrument, if they were adorn'd with convenient notes" (Observations in the Art of English Poesie, 1602, Chaps. VII, IX; Smith, II, 346 ff.). Peacham mentions the lyric in passing, assigning its subject as natural and moral philosophy! Horace he holds highest of Greek and Latin lyrists. Following Scaliger he believes that the style of Horace is more accurate and sententious than that of Pindar (The Compleat Gentleman, 1622; see Spingarn, Critical Essays of the 17th Century, vol. I, pp. 117, 127). Hobbes, like Bacon (see above, § 2), assigns no independent category to lyrics, which he regards as "but essayes and parts of an entire poem" (for Hobbes, see below, § 8). Cowley, creator of the pseudo-Pindaric ode (but see Ronsard's Pindaric experiments, a century earlier), holds that the ode is the boldest and most irregular form of the lyric (Preface to Poems, 1656; Spingarn, II, 86; see also Cowley's Ode, The Resurrection). Sprat, in his Life and Writings of Cowley (1668), defends the irregularities of the Cowleyan ode on the ground of its near affinity with prose: "The practice of it will only exalt, not corrupt our Prose" (see Spingarn, II, 131–132). Edward Phillips notices the subject of the lyric as "Love, or other the most soft and delightfull subject, in verse most apt for Musical Composition" (see Spingarn, II, 267). The Earl of Mulgrave treats lightly of song, elegy, and ode, recommending chiefly ease of expression and high fancy (Essay on Poetry, 1682; see the Works, 2 vols., 1723, I, 133–136). Sir William Temple (Of Poetry, 1690) assigns love, and often praise, as the subjects of the lyric; calls Horace the first and last of "true Lyrick Poets among the Latins"; and is at pains to inform us that grief is the subject of the elegy. See also B. Kennet, The Lives and Characters of the Ancient Grecian Poets (2 Pts. Lond.: 1697).

C. *Eighteenth Century.*

On 18th century criticism see Gayley and Scott, p. 406 ff.; Saintsbury, Hist. Crit., vol. III, Bk. VII, Chaps. III, V, VI; W. H. Durham, Critical Essays of the 18th Century (Yale Univ. Press, 1915; see the Introd.); Hamelius, Vaughan, and Blankenburg, as noted above.

In this age of lyric decline, both poets and critics valued the lyric lightly. The greater poets condescended to the lyric, and it became, in part, a trifle of the "wits," a *vers de société*. The ode, however, of all lyric kinds the furthest in spirit from a poetry of wit, was a favorite form during the period, — the form to which most of the criticism of the lyric attached itself. Critics were not unaware of the thinness of contemporary lyric performance. While they complained of the conceits of lyric verse, they tried to better matters by severer regulations of poetic genius, especially in the writing of odes. In general the attitude of literary opinion regarding the type under consideration was best indicated by what critics did not say, — by the comparative dearth of reference or appraisal. A case of *lucus a non lucendo*.

The age of wit decried "enthusiasm," especially that of the religious sort, as a species of insanity. See, for example, Shaftesbury's Letter Concerning Enthusiasm, 1708, in which he argues for a less vituperative use of the term; see also his Moralists, Pt. III, § 2, and his Miscellaneous Reflections, Misc. II, Chap. I; and compare Locke, Essay Concerning Human Understanding, 1690, Bk. IV, Chap. XIX, § 7, and Henry More's Enthusiasmus Triumphatus, in his Philosophical Writings, 1662. See also *The Spectator*, No. 201, 1711, and John Byrom's Enthusiasm, A Poetical Essay, 1751, in Chalmers' Eng. Poets, vol. XV, pp. 248–252. Sir Leslie Stephen refers to the subject in his Hist. of Eng. Thought in the 18th Century (2 vols., 3d ed., Lond.: 1902, vol. II, p. 370). In connection with these utterances concerning "enthusiasm" should be studied various essays and poems on the "imagination" published during the century (see the references to Addison, Akenside, etc., in Gayley and Scott, p. 407 ff.).

Since this was an age of periodicals, the student should not forget that scattered references to the lyric may be found in such publications as *The Monthly Review*, *The Gentleman's Magazine*, *The Literary Magazine*, *The British Magazine*, *The Lady's Magazine*, *The Critical Review*, and *The Public Ledger*. See also the collection in Chalmers' British Essayists, — *Tatler*, *Spectator*, *Guardian*, *Rambler*, *Adventurer*, *World*, *Connoisseur*, *Idler*, *Mirror*, *Lounger*, *Observer*, *Looker-On*.

The second half of the century witnessed a revival of lyric development, furthered by the romantic revolt which had been gathering force since 1739–40 (Thomson and Joseph Warton). With the success of the revolt came a broader view of lyric meaning and a fitter appreciation of lyric genius. The movement against the conventions of the age of Pope, especially in relation to diction and the attitude toward nature and the natural, expressed itself directly in lyric numbers (Lyrical Ballads, 1798); but the critical argument and justification fell mainly in the next century (Gayley, Lit. Studies in the 19th Century, in Proc. of St. Louis Congress of Arts and Sciences, Boston: 1906, vol. III, p. 332 ff.).

The following references are typical: E. Bysshe's Art of English Poetry (1700?), Chap. III Of Rules for Making Verses. Congreve, in his Discourse of the Pindaric Ode (1705; see Chalmers' Eng. Poets, vol. X), reproaches the English Pindarics of his age with their lack of regularity, and expounds the general structure of Pindar's odes. Was Congreve the first, in England, to understand the real nature of Pindar's odes? Cf. Gray, below, and see Cowley, above. Material on the lyric is contained in J. Barnes' Anacreon . . . emendatus (Lond.: 1705). M. Prior's Preface to his Ode . . . to the Queen, on the Glorious Success of her Majesty's Arms (1706). I. Watts is concerned, of course, with the "divine" uses of poetry: see the Preface to his Horae Lyricae (1709). Addison, in No. 223 of the *Spectator* (Nov. 15, 1711; cf. No. 229), complains of those "little points, conceits, and turns of wit, with which many of our modern lyrics are so miserably infected." L. Welsted, Trans. of Longinus and Remarks on Eng. Poets (1712). Steele's references to the lyric are usually flippant, but see the essay On Songs and Song Writing, in No. 16 of the *Guardian* (1713). J. Trapp, Praelectiones Poeticae (1716; 3d ed., 2 vols., Lond.: 1736, vol. II, pp. 1–105), short chapters on epigram, elegy, pastoral, and lyric. C. Gildon's The Complete Art of Poetry (2 vols., 1718, vol. I, pp. 172–186) contains a weak discussion of the lyric (which is traced back to the songs of Moses and Miriam), consisting of almost nothing more than flattering quotations of Buckingham. E. Young's Discourse on Odes (1725) and his famous Essay on Original Composition breathe a vital air. The Essay upon Unnatural Flights in Poetry, by Lord Lansdowne (George Granville), is not addressed to the lyrists in particular, but it is a good example of distrust of poetic enthusiasm (see the Works, 1732). J. Hughes, in the Preface to Six Cantatas, or Poems for Music (see Chalmers, vol. XIII), remarks on the relation of lyric poetry to music, and quotes Waller's verse: "Soft words, with nothing in them, make a song"; see also the verses on songs and on odes in the same author's Essay on Poetry. Joseph Warton's The Enthusiast, or the Love of Nature (1740) is an appeal for a return to sincerity of observation and sanity of description; his Preface to Odes on Several Subjects (1746) launches poetry fairly on the romantic stream. See also his Essay on Pope (1756–82), Sect. II Of Windsor Forest, and Lyric Pieces. T. Gray, Letters (Ed. Gosse), Nos. 44, 119, 142 (1742–58): though the criticism contained in these letters is of a slight and epistolary sort, the student may gather somewhat of vital significance, — such, for instance, as the suggestion (No. 44) that "the language of the age is never the language of poetry, except among the French," or the statement concerning the beauty of the lyric (No. 142), or the disquisition on epic and lyric style (No. 119). Cf. Gray (E. M. L.), by E. Gosse (N.Y.: 1882), Chap. VI, The Pindaric Odes. M. Akenside, Ode XIII, On Lyric Poetry, in Odes on Several Subjects, Bk. I (1745). G. West, Preface to the Odes of Pindar (1749): another protest against the incoherence and metrical irregularity of Cowley and his followers; see also the Dissertations, which are added to the translation, and Joseph Warton's Ode Occasioned by Reading Mr. West's Translation of Pindar, which is prefixed to the translation. In R. Lowth's De Sacra Poësi Hebraeorum Praelectiones Academicae, etc. (Oxonii: 1753. Translation by G. Gregory, New Ed. by C. E. Stowe, Andover: 1829), see Chaps. XXII–XXXIV, especially XXV–XXVIII. Bishop Hurd's remarks on the relation of genius to rule-criticism are especially applicable to lyric poetry (see the Notes, l. 404, appended to his edition of Horace's Epistola ad Pisones, and the corresponding passage in the commentary. 1757). O. Goldsmith, Essay on the Origin of Poetry (Essays, 1758–65): the origin of lyric poetry in primitive religious enthusiasm. J. Newberry, The Art of Poetry on a New Plan, etc. (2 vols. 1761–62): a weak, good-natured, unoriginal thing, intended for the young. J. Ogilvie, Poems on Various Subjects, To which is prefix'd an Essay on the Lyric Poetry of the Ancients, etc. (Lond.: 1762; cf. below, § 9, VII, C). Dr. J. Brown's A Dissertation on the Rise, Union and Power, the Progressions, Separations, and Corruptions of Poetry and Music, etc. (Lond.: 1763) was a famous book in its day. Compare Some Observations on Dr. Brown's Dissertation, etc. (Lond.: 1764), and Remarks on Some Observations, etc. (Lond.: 1764). In 1764 the original Dissertation was republished, with some changes, as The History of the Rise and Progress of Poetry, etc. The work was translated into French, Italian, and German (see Blankenburg, 1797, vol. II, p. 318). E. Evans, Some Specimens of the Poetry of the Ancient Welsh Bards (Lond.: 1764), with a Diss. on Bards. W. Shenstone, Essay on Elegy (Works in Verse and Prose, 2 vols. 1764). J. Aikin, Essays on Song-Writing: with a collection of such English songs as are most eminent for poetical merit, etc. (1772): one of the most considerable discussions of the lyric that appeared during this century in England. The first essay includes a brief historical introduction (in which Ossian and Theocritus are exhibited as types of the two varieties of earliest song-writers), discusses the union of song and music, defines song, and differentiates the lyric according to manner of composition, by which is meant musical accompaniment (though such distinctions as sonnet, rondeau, and vaudeville are regarded as "unessential to the poetical character of any composition"). It differentiates the song from other lyrics by subject, confining it to gaiety and tenderness, and maintaining that the graver and sublimer strains are proper to the ode, and it divides songs into ballads, pathetic or descriptive songs, and witty songs. There follow short essays on Ballads and Pastoral Songs, Passionate and Descriptive Songs, Ingenious and Witty Songs. T. Warton, Hist. of English Poetry (3 vols. 1774–81). V. Knox, Essays, Moral and Literary (1777): see No. 127, On the Prevailing Taste in Poetry. For Johnson's famous criticism of the "metaphysical poets," and for his criticism of Cowley's Pindarics, see his Life of Cowley. Johnson's other Lives should also be studied (1779–81). Hugh Blair, in his Lectures on Rhetoric and Belles Lettres (1783; see vol. II, Lect. XXXIX Pastoral Poetry, Lyric Poetry), treats *ode* and *lyric* as synonymous terms, and utters a conscientious warning against lyric extravagance. J. Scott of Amwell, Critical Essays (1785). W. Preston, Thoughts on Lyric Poesie (in *Transactions of the Royal Irish Academy for 1787.* Dublin: 1788). Coleridge, On the Sonnet (Poems, 1797), after reading the poems of Bowles and Charlotte Smith: the reawakening of lyrical genius and of a more adequate idea of the lyric species.

D. *Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries.*

On the criticism of this period see Gayley and Scott, pp. 413–422; Saintsbury, Hist. Crit., vol. III, Bk. VIII, Chap. I, Bk. IX, Chaps. II, III; E. D. Jones, English Critical Essays, 19th Century (Oxford: 1916).

The criticism of this period has been so varied and so plentiful that the task of determining just what it has added in a speculative way to the theory of a poetic type is very difficult. By way of narrowing the field it must be noted, of course, that the growth of philological research in our universities has in the latter part of the age tended to turn criticism from the more personal and subjective methods of the essayists to a more objective though not always scientific methodology. Historical study, distrustful of theory, has preferred narrow investigation to philosophical generalization. An account of the resulting criticism need not, therefore, be undertaken at this point; it will be found below, § 6, where works dealing with the history of the lyric are listed in connection with brief outlines of the growth of the lyric literatures of the various nations.

Our present task is to rummage the almost countless literary essays — critical and semi-historical and biographical, appreciative and interpretative — which have been a characteristic product of the period ever since the establishment of the great reviews early in the nineteenth century (*Edinburgh Rev.* 1802, *Quarterly Rev.* 1809, *Blackwood's Mag.* 1817, *London Mag.* 1820). From this material the student may gather suggestions, asides, and assumptions that bear upon lyric theory. He will find that there is an indefinable consensus, readily applicable to the lyric, as to what is good poetry and what is not good. Constantly he will come across patches of descriptive appreciation allusively illustrating the subject. But comparatively seldom will he discover reasoned inductions of the general laws of the type; he will search in vain for a commonly received basis of definition, division, or other method. If the historical spirit is distrustful of theory, the appreciative talent is scarcely equal to the task. Moreover, the absence of a determined reliance on classical models, such as supported and regulated the criticism of former centuries, makes for greater variety of criticism and less agreement in detailed result; gives opportunity for imaginative originality and the expression of aesthetic idiosyncrasy. Consequently the criticism of the century has made of itself an art which no longer can be fully regarded from the single point of view of the historian of critical theory. Indeed, the student will commit an error who approaches these literary essays primarily for the purpose of furthering his analysis of poetic kinds: the essays for the most part should be read for aesthetic pleasure.

To trace even the main currents of criticism through this bewilderment of theory is no simple affair; but the pages in Gayley and Scott referred to above may furnish guidance. The spiritual phases of the period are many and often mutually contradictory; yet most of them have found lyrical utterance, and have, in turn, affected the temper of lyric criticism. By way of example some of these phases may here receive brief mention.

The enunciation of the romantic principle by Wordsworth and

Coleridge involved both lyric expression and lyric theory. Critical argument in favor of those new fashions of diction and subject-matter that had been introduced in the Lyrical Ballads (1798) makes its appearance in the Prefaces of Wordsworth. The contemporary reviews of Wordsworth's poems and prefaces should be explored; and from the Prefaces as a starting point a systematic study might well be made of the poetic diction of the English lyric. Similar tempting fields of research are offered by the contemporary periodical criticism of later developments of the lyric, e.g., the critical welcome (and disapproval) of the pre-Raphaelitic school, or of the Irish Movement.

Classicism, revived in the cold and brilliant, formal and genteel criticism of Jeffrey, in the startling, personal criticism of Gifford and Lockhart, and in the more mellow judgments of Wilson and Southey, was concerned with the lyrism of many besides its two chief victims, Burns and Keats. But in spite of the classical reaction the new enthusiasm had its way. Romantic criticism came to its own in Shelley and Coleridge, Leigh Hunt and Hazlitt, the modern kin of Longinus, through an insistence upon the qualities which most of all characterized the romantic lyric, — new poetic diction, emotional suggestion, free creative imagination, wonder, and personal subjectivity. To discover new effects of sound and image was the object of the new poetic performance and the criterion of its success. The "jingling rhythm" and "resplendent gibberish" of some such attempts naturally provoked in certain quarters adverse criticism: as, for instance, the 1849 *Blackwood* article on Tennyson (cited with relish by Professor Saintsbury, Hist. Crit., 3: 502). But the aim of the new criticism was sympathetic interpretation of the author, of his feelings, images, and thoughts as enshrined in the poem. The legislative criticism of Dryden, Addison, Pope, and Johnson gave way to alluring adventures in interpretation. Since the spirit of such interpretative adventures was essentially rhapsodical and lyrical, what wonder that criticism should concern itself in very large measure with the lyric!

Here is Carlyle's declaration of the new way, — of what a critic must know before he pronounces a poet in fault:

> First, we must have made plain to ourselves what the poet's aim really and truly was, how the task he had to do stood before his own eye, and how far, with such means as it afforded him, he has fulfilled it. Secondly, we must have decided whether and how far this aim, this task of his, accorded, — not with *us*, and our individual crotchets, and the crotchets of our little senate where we give or take the law, — but with human nature, and the nature of things at large; with the universal principles of poetic beauty, not as they stand written in our text-books, but in the hearts and imaginations of all men (Essay on Goethe, 1828).

Such qualification for criticism, we reflect, is the property of a demigod. When arrogated by less than a demigod, the supposed qualification is likely to be the apotheosis of personal preference — that is to say, taste or feeling — under the assumption that all men feel or should feel as the self-exalted critic. How often did the critical effort of even such men as Hazlitt, Coleridge, and Carlyle attain to this marvellous insight into the author's genius — to this universal knowledge of the secrets of human hearts? "The lyrical critic judging the lyrist" — that is the characteristic tableau presented by the new criticism. We must acknowledge, however, that the mysticism of Carlyle and the dreams of De Quincey not only add lyric intensity and loveliness to their prose-poetry but at times illuminate their criticism with gleams of genuine insight into the essentials of literary theory. Note, for instance, the descant on Song in Sartor Resartus, or the analysis of lyrical emotion in De Quincey's essay on Wordsworth's Poetry (see above, § 2).

Poetics was meanwhile not unaffected by the rise of the ethical theory of utilitarianism and the development of science. Speculative forerunners of the attempt to correlate criticism with such movements were J. S. Mill, Herbert Spencer, and G. H. Lewes. But the advance of the century in utilitarian philosophy, scientific discovery, invention, and commerce necessitated a readjustment of social, political, philosophical, and religious values: and the lyric embodies with increasing frequency the suffering and the joy, the reactions and escapes of individual souls rendered introspective by the need of such readjustments. Hence a profound development of the subjective power of the lyric, and a renewed critical emphasis upon its subjective nature. Herein lies one of the chief contributions of this period to the theory of the lyric. Never before had the subjective, mysterious, and utterly poetic character of the lyric been so distinctly emphasized, or, as nineteenth-century critics would say, *recognized.* This recognition is the keynote to most of the critical utterances concerning the lyric that have appeared during the later nineteenth century; and not seldom a certain spirit of lyric lawlessness keeps company with the recognition.

Here, too, must be mentioned the comparative, 'touchstone' method of Arnold, developing in his hands at least to serene judgment and successful didacticism concerning qualities and degrees in this or that poet's performance, but seldom giving us generalizations on types (for an exposition of the *raison d'être* and the limitations of the 'test-passage' or 'touchstone' see Gayley's Principles of Poetry, pp. cvi–cix). To determine whether this poem is good or bad poetry, and why, is Arnold's frequent purpose. To describe subtly and sweetly one's deeper pleasure in reading is the hedonistic aim of Walter Pater. "What special sense," writes Pater, "does Wordsworth exercise, and what instincts does he satisfy? What were the subjects and motives which in him excite the imaginative faculty? What are the qualities in things and persons which he values, the impression and sense of which he can convey to others, in an extraordinary way?" Power of poetic expression, or "expressiveness," to use the watchword of the school of Croce, is after all the main interest for both Arnold and Pater, and for all the critics, romantic and other, with Professor Saintsbury at their head, who may be said to be in substantial accord with these two Victorians.

Still another interest is found in the mass of modern criticism, the biographic-historical-sociological interest that derives from Hegel through Sainte-Beuve (the master of Matthew Arnold), Taine, and Brunetière. A poem — even a lyric poem — is to be 'explained' by viewing the author from as many different angles as possible, with the faith that in a fine mixture of antecedents and causes will be found a sufficient *raison d'être* for the poem, including its peculiarities. On this and on other developments of the scientific-historical method, see Gayley's Literary Studies in the Nineteenth Century (St. Louis Congress of Arts and Sciences, Boston: 1906, vol. III, pp. 336–340, 342–346).

Concerning compilations, works on poetics and aesthetics, and introductions to poetry — original, eclectic, or servile; profound, gentlemanly, or capricious — we need add little to what is written in § 2, above.

In the introductions to works dealing with the history of the English lyric (see Reed, Erskine, Schelling, and Rhys, mentioned below, § 5), and in essays prefixed to some of the anthologies of the English lyric (e.g., the anthologies of Palgrave, F. I. Carpenter, A. H. Bullen, Sir Sidney Lee, E. K. Chambers, F. E. Schelling, Gosse, Henley, Locker-Lampson, Hunt and Lee, Brander Matthews, A. T. Quiller-Couch, N. Hepple, — all of which may be traced through the index to this volume), may be found brief utterances on the nature of the lyric and some of its kinds. The general approbation with which at present all historical essays are greeted serves somewhat to blind us to the lack of distinct method and system in most recent treatises upon the lyric. As a rule, they are descriptive rather than definitive, and show only slight attempts at scientific method. It is indeed inevitable that in works of this character the author should flee fast and far from the undeniable difficulties of exact definition and division into the labyrinth of historical observation or gossip, or take refuge in the anthology itself behind the noncommittal trellis of a footnote.

Finally, it should be noted that attention has been turned to the psychological study of poetic genius and poetic rhythm, and that this study bears both directly and indirectly upon the nature of the lyric. The importance of the psychological method of approach can scarcely be overrated. It is indeed characteristic of scientific study into questions of literary quality and function that hitherto have been treated speculatively. A typical and excellent example of the best that has been done is Ribot's Essay on the Creative Imagination (trans. by A. H. Baron (Chicago: 1906)); but see the references given by Gayley and Scott, p. 138. Examples of the study of rhythm by experimental psychologists are found in the *American Journal of Psychology*, 6: 2 (T. L. Bolton), 12: 360 (N. Triplett and E. C. Sanford), 12: 492 (C. R. Squire), etc. See also Hurst and Mackay, Experiments on the Tune Relations of Poetical Metres (*Univ. of Toronto Studies, Psychol. Series*, No. 3); Scripture, in *Studies from the Yale Psychol. Lab.*, 7: 95 (1899); R. C. Givler, The Psycho-physiological Effect of the Elements of Speech in Relation to Poetry (*Psychol. Rev. Publications*, vol. XIX, No. 2, April, 1916, Princeton); W. M. Patterson, The Rhythm of Prose (Columbia Univ. Press: 1917). Further references, including foreign monographs, in Gayley and Scott, § 23.

The main body of references for historical criticism, as already stated, will be found below, § 6, XI, F. Some works, English and American, dealing more exclusively with aesthetic questions or appreciation are listed here; but the most important of this sort will be found in § 2, above. There the student should note the following: Alden, Alexander, Ambros, Bayne, Beeching, Browning, Caine, Courthope, Dennis, De Quincey, Erskine, Fuller, Gayley, Gosse, Gould, Guest, Gummere, Gurney, Hepple, Hudson, Hunt, Keble, Lee, Locker-Lampson, Mackail, Mill, Moulton, Neilson, Noble, Palgrave, Pattison, Patmore, Peck, Poe, Posnett, Quiller-Couch, Reed, Rhys, Saintsbury, Schelling, Sharp, Shelley, Stedman, Swinburne, Symonds, Thompson, Tomlinson, Watts-Dunton, Winchester, Woodberry, Wordsworth. General discussions of many of the works that follow are offered by Gayley and Scott, §§ 20, 21 B. For Reviews, Magazines, etc., see Appendix.

W. L. Bowles, Concluding Observations on the Poetic Character of Mr. Pope (in vol. X of his edition of Pope's Works, 1806): the Byron-Bowles controversy which followed, on the relative merit of objects of nature and art as subjects of poetry, has little or nothing for the student of the lyric (see R. Kahn, Die Pope-Kritik im 18. Jahrh., Emmendingen: 1910, p. 102 ff. See also T. E. Casson, W. L. Bowles, in Eighteenth Century Literature: An Oxford Miscellany, 1909, pp. 151–183; H. Beers, Hist. of Eng. Romanticism in the Nineteenth Century, Chap. II, with bibliography of Bowles' pamphlets, p. 73, note (N.Y.: 1901)). Coleridge, Lectures on English Poets (1808, 1812); Biographia Literaria (1817), Chaps. I (Bowles), IV and XIII–XIV (Lyrical Ballads, Imagination and Fancy, etc.). Consider Coleridge's distinction between the "faculties" (note the basis in the discredited facultative psychology) of imagination and fancy, and its applicability to the study of the lyric. For Coleridge's indebtedness for this distinction to Richter, and for the development of the idea by Wordsworth and Leigh Hunt, see Professor Cook's Leigh Hunt's What is Poetry (pp. 75–94). For a note on elegy and ode see the Table Talk, Oct. 23, 1833. J. Aikin, Vocal Poetry, or a select collection of English songs, to which is prefixed an essay on song-writing (Lond.: 1810). The author enlarges the collection of 1772 (noted above), and writes a new essay embodying his maturer views of the nature and kinds of song, amending his former classification and considering at some length the relation of song to ballad. W. Wordsworth, in the preface to his Poems (1815), adopts the following classification: "the hymn, the ode, the elegy, the song, and the ballad." Consider his idea of "impassioned recitation" as taking the place of musical accompaniment. With Wordsworth's ideas on poetry (see Gayley and Scott, pp. 345, 411–412), as found in his Prefaces (1798, 1802, etc.), compare Coleridge's criticism in the Biographia Literaria (see the selections from Wordsworth and Coleridge in Saintsbury's Loci Critici); for an earlier recognition of the power of "language unadorned," see *The Spectator*, No. 85. Hazlitt's famous Lectures on the English Poets (1818), — interpretative, suggestive; see also his Spirit of the Age (Lond.: 1825). Leigh Hunt, What is Poetry? (1844). Francis Jeffrey, Contributions to the *Edinburgh Review* (4 vols. 1844), — 'intellectual,' rarely sympathetic toward mysticism and romanticism, formal, stiff, and glittering; see the criticisms of Wordsworth, Byron, Scott, Keats, Burns, etc. Walter Bagehot, Hartley Coleridge (1852), in vol. I of Literary Studies (2 vols. 2d ed. Lond.: 1879). Lyrical poetry is designed to express "some one mood, some single sentiment, some isolated longing in human nature. It deals not with man as a whole, but with man piecemeal, with man in a scenic aspect, with man in a peculiar light. Hence lyrical poets must not be judged literally from their lyrics." "Self-delineative" poetry grows out of the lyric, but is distinct from it; Hartley Coleridge offers excellent examples of this type. See also the same author's essays on Shelley (1856), Béranger (1857), Clough (1862), Wordsworth, Tennyson, and Browning; or Pure, Ornate, and Grotesque Art in English Poetry (1864). G. B., Alfred Tennyson's Poems, in Cambridge Essays

1855 (Lond.: 1855). Peter Bayne, Tennyson, Elizabeth Barrett Browning, in Essays in Biography and Criticism, 1st Series (Boston: 1857). L. Hunt and S. A. Lee, The Book of the Sonnet (2 vols. Boston ed.: 1867), with introd. on "The Sonnet: its Origin, Structure, and Place in Poetry." A. C. Swinburne, William Blake, Chap. II Lyrical Poems (1868). T. Hood, Studies in the Field of *vers de société* (in *London Society*, May, 1870). Hodgson's Theory of Practice (2 vols. Lond.: 1870): see vol. I, pp. 264–305 Poetical Emotions. R. H. Hutton, Literary Essays (1871). R. Buchanan ("Thomas Maitland"), The Fleshly School of Poetry: Mr. D. G. Rossetti (in *Contemp. Rev.*, Oct. 1871). D. G. Rossetti, The Stealthy School of Criticism (in *Athenæum*, 1871). H. G. Hewlett, Poets of Society (in *Contemp. Rev.*, July, 1872). Robert Buchanan, Master-Spirits (Lond.: 1873), — various essays of earlier date. S. A. Brooke, Theology in the English Poets (Lond.: 1874). A. C. Swinburne, Essays and Studies (1875); A Study of Ben Jonson, p. 97 ff. (1889); Studies in Prose and Poetry (1894), especially the chapters on Herrick and Social Verse, but the essays on Victor Hugo, particularly *Toute la Lyre*, are full of suggestive appreciation. See also Swinburne's A Study of Victor Hugo (Lond.: 1886). R. H. Hutton, Essays in Literary Criticism (American ed., 1876). Note the following in the essay on Matthew Arnold: "It is of the essence [of lyrical poetry] to reflect absolutely the mood of the poet, to begin where he begins and end where he ends, — the only artistic demand which can possibly be applicable to the *structure* of such pieces, is that it shall show you the growth and subsidence of a vein of thought and emotion, and make no abrupt demands on the sympathy of the reader" (p. 344). J. C. Shairp, Studies in Philosophy and Poetry (1872): Poetic Interpretation of Nature (1877); Aspects of Poetry, p. 194 (1882). W. A. Barrett, English Glee and Madrigal Writers (Lond.: 1877). E. Gosse, A Plea for Certain Exotic Forms of Verse (in *Cornhill Mag.*, July, 1877): English Odes (Lond.: 1881); Coventry Patmore (1905). Edward Dowden, Studies in Literature, 1789–1877 (Lond.: 1878); Transcripts and Studies (1888); Life of Shelley (Lond.: 1886); New Studies in Literature (Lond.: 1895); French Revolution and English Lit. (Lond.: 1897); Puritan and Anglican, Chap. IV (2d ed. 1901); Browning (1904); Essays, Modern and Elizabethan (1910). Some of the sanest, justest, sweetest criticism of the century is contained in these volumes. J. B. Selkirk, Ethics and Aesthetics of Modern Poetry (Lond.: 1878). W. Bagehot, Literary Studies (Lond.: 1879). C. Kingsley, Burns and his School (1880). A. Dobson, Introd. to Praed's poems in the

4th vol. of Ward's English Poets: on *vers de société.* George Brimley, Tennyson, Wordsworth, etc., in Essays (Lond.: 1882), all of earlier date than this collection. F. T. Palgrave, Essay on Spenser's Minor Poems (in vol. IV of Spenser's Complete Works, Ed. by A. B. Grosart, 10 vols., 1882–84). R. W. Emerson, essays on the Poet and on Poetry and Imagination (Complete Works, 1883–84). W. Sharp, Dante Gabriel Rossetti, a Record and a Study (1883). *Sat. Rev.*, 57: 25 (Jan. 5, 1884), — a criticism of the vague idea of the lyric held by the editor of Eng. Lyrics (Parchment Library, Lond.: 1883); see also *Sat. Rev.*, 62: 692. Spencer's Principles of Psychology (2 vols. N.Y.: 1885), vol. II, pp. 539–557 Language of the Emotions. T. Watts-Dunton, Dante Gabriel Rossetti (in Encyc. Brit., 9th ed., 1886); see above, § 2, for other references to same author. Aubrey de Vere, Wordsworth, Shelley and Keats, Landor, in Essays, Chiefly on Poetry (2 vols. Lond.: 1887). W. P. Begg, The Development of Taste, etc. (Glasgow: 1887), Chap. II Nature in Hebrew Lyric. Walter Pater, Browning (1887), etc., in Essays from *The Guardian* (Lond.: 1901). J. Veitch, The Feeling for Nature in Scottish Poetry (2 vols. Edinb.: 1887). Matthew Arnold, Essays in Criticism, 2d Series (1888), especially the papers on The Study of Poetry, on Shelley, on Byron. C. C. Everett, Poetry, Comedy, and Duty (1888). A. Lang's Letters on Literature (2d ed. Lond.: 1889) contains two charming, informal letters on *vers de société.* J. A. Symonds, Essays, Speculative and Suggestive (2 vols., Lond.: 1890), vol. II, p. 181 ff. Is Music the Type or Measure of All Art?, being a review of W. Pater's The School of Giorgione, which appeared in the *Fort. Rev.*, Oct. 1887: suggestive of the relation of lyric inspiration to all art. By the same, The Lyrism of the English Romantic Drama (in The Key of Blue and other Prose Essays. Lond.: 1893). Brother Azarias, Spiritual Sense of In Memoriam, in Phases of Thought and Criticism (Boston: 1893). W. J. Courthope, Hist. of English Poetry (6 vols., 1895–1910), *passim.* A. C. Benson, Essays (1896). S. Baring-Gould's English Minstrelsie (1896) contains an historical introduction on English national song and opera. James Thompson ("B. V."), Biographical and Critical Studies (Lond.: 1896). W. E. Henley, English Lyrics (Lond.: 1897): see the Introduction for an antithesis between temperamental and epigrammatic lyrics. J. M. Robertson, New Essays towards a Critical Method (Lond.: 1897), p. 191 ff. Shelley and Poetry. Alfred Ainger, Cowper, Burns, Scott (1898), in vol. I of Lectures and Essays (2 vols. Lond.: 1905). W. C. Bronson, The Poems of William Collins, Introd. (Boston: 1898). W. E. Henley, Views and Reviews, Essays in Appreciation (2 vols. 1891–92); by the same, Burns: Life, Genius, Appreciation (1898). J. W. Bray, A Hist. of English Crit. Terms, p. 181 (Boston: 1898). L. E. Gates, Studies and Appreciations, Three Lyrical Modes (N. Y.: 1900). W. Archer, Poets of the Younger Generation (Lond.: 1902), — an admirable review. G. E. Woodberry, Makers of Literature (N. Y.: 1900); Swinburne (1905). T. R. Price, The Technic of Shakespere's Sonnets (in Studies in Honor of Basil Lanneau Gildersleeve. Baltimore: 1902). A. B. Walkley, War and Poetry (in *Edinb. Rev.*, July, 1902). S. Lee, Elizabethan Sonnets (New English Garner. 2 vols. N. Y.: 1904). T. Watts-Dunton, The Renascence of Wonder in Poetry (in Chambers' Cyclop. of Eng. Lit., 1904, vol. III). B. Matthews, American Familiar Verse (N. Y.: 1904): the first part of the Introduction sketches the nature of what Cowper called "Familiar Verse." A. Symons, Studies in Prose and Verse (1904); by the same, The Romantic Movement in Poetry (1909). C. Weygandt, The Irish Literary Revival (in *The Sewanee Review*, XII, No. 4, Oct. 1904; see also other articles by the same author in the same periodical). P. E. More, Elizabethan Sonnets (in *N. Y. Evening Post*, Aug. 6, 1904); see also the same author's Shelburne Essays, Third Series (N. Y.: 1906), pp. 124–142 Christina Rossetti: a short but penetrative study of the personality of one of the best examples of the modern, subjective lyrist, Christina Rossetti. Mr. More finds that her lyric secret lies in a "perfectly passive attitude toward the powers that command her heart and soul." See also the other Series of Shelburne Essays. W. H. Sheran, A Handbook of Literary Criticism (N. Y.: 1905), pp. 514–547. R. H. Case, English Epithalamies (Lond.: 1906). F. B. Gummere, Originality and Convention in Literature (in *Quart. Rev.*, Jan. 1906): on the superior power of "convention" in the lyric, as compared with other literary kinds. S. A. Brooke, Studies in Poetry (Lond.: 1907), — see the study on Shelley; by the same, Four Victorian Poets (Clough, Rossetti, Arnold, Morris), 1908. E. K. Chambers, Some Aspects of Mediaeval Lyric, in Chambers and Sidgwick, Early English Lyrics, etc. (Lond.: 1907). Oliver Elton, Tennyson, Swinburne, in Modern Studies (Lond.: 1907). E. G. Sihler, Testimonium Animae, etc. (N. Y.: 1908), Chap. V Voices from the Lyrical Poets. F. Thompson, Shelley (in *The Dublin Rev.*, July, 1908). A. C. Bradley, Oxford Lectures on Poetry (Lond.: 1909). H. T. Peck, Studies in Several Literatures (N. Y.: 1909), IV The Lyrics of Tennyson. B. de Selincourt, William Blake (1909). R. Le Gallienne, Attitudes and Avowals (1910). G. Murray, What English

Poetry may still learn from Greek (in *Atlantic Mo.*, Nov. 1912), — an admirable essay. H. C. Beeching, Blake's Religious Lyrics (in Essays and Studies by Members of the English Association, vol. III, 1912). Amy Cruse, The Elizabethan Lyrists and their Poetry (Lond.: 1913).

For the modernization of old French metres (rondeau, rondel, triolet, etc.) in England, see A. Dobson's Note on Some Foreign Forms of Verse (in Latter-Day Lyrics. Ed. by W. D. Adams. Lond.: 1878); E. W. Gosse, in the *Cornhill Mag.*, July, 1877; Alden, English Verse (N. Y.: 1903), pp. 359–388; Gayley and Young, Princ. and Prog. Engl. Poetry, 87–91. Compare the French revival of these old forms; see T. de Banville, Odes funambulesques, Petit traité de poésie française, and other works.

VI. **German.**

For general reviews of German criticism see Gayley and Scott, pp. 422–428, where the history of German poetics is resumed under five periods; Saintsbury's Hist. of Crit.; É. Grucker, Histoire des doctrines littéraires et esthétiques en Allemagne (Paris: 1883).

A. *To the Eighteenth Century.*

For German criticism to the 18th century see Gayley and Scott, p. 422; Saintsbury, vol. II, Bk. V, Chap. III; K. Borinski, Die Poetik der Renaissance und der Anfang der literarischen Kritik in Deutschland (Berlin: 1886); T. S. Perry, From Opitz to Lessing (Boston: 1885); Blankenburg, as noted above, § 2.

German criticism up to the time of Bodmer (1721) is purely formalistic, relies upon foreign poetics (Italian and French), and is negligible in the history of the criticism of the lyric. For early treatises in Latin on Latin prosody, see Borinski, pp. 15–55; notice also what Borinski has to say on the influence of Luther. For the critical point of view of the Latin versifiers of the age of Luther see Conrad Celtes, Ars versificandi et carminum (Leipz.: 1486; cf. A. Schroeter, Beiträge zur Gesch. der neulat. Poesie, etc., *Palaestra*, 77: 1). To the year 1571 belongs Adam Puschmann's Gründlicher Bericht des deutschen Meistergesangs (in Niemeyer's Neudrucke. Halle: 1888). Puschmann was a pupil of Hans Sachs. Voss detects a lyrical character in the earliest poetry of the race (Saintsbury, Hist. Crit., 1: 359). Opitz, who himself practised the lyric in a didactic and sententious style, speaks of it ineffectually in his Buch von der deutschen Poeterey (1624). He says that the lyric requires in the poet a free and happy spirit, and the ornament of sententious epigram. Love is recognized as a natural subject, but passion is feared: the Christian should be more restrained in poetic passion than the heathen (see Chap. V of the work; cf. Borinski, 72–74; Grucker, *op. cit.*, 163–164; Veránek, M. Opitz in seinem Verhältniss zu Scaliger und Ronsard (Vienna: 1883. Progr.)). For Birken (1679), see below, § 6, XIII, D. D. G. Morhof touches upon the lyric in his Unterricht von der deutschen Sprache und Poesie, deren Ursprung, Fortgang und Lehrsätzen (Kiel: 1682), Chap. XV.

B. *The Eighteenth Century.*

See Gayley and Scott, pp. 423–425; Saintsbury, vol. II, Bk. VI, Chap. III, and vol. III, Bk. VII, Chaps. II, V; F. Braitmaier, Geschichte der poetischen Theorie und Kritik von den Diskursen der Maler bis auf Lessing (2 Thl. Frauenfeld: 1888–89); T. S. Perry, as noted above; B. Bosanquet, Hist. of Aesthetic, 210 ff. (Lond.: 1904); O. Neboliczka, Schäferdichtung und Poetik im 18. Jahrh. (in *Vierteljahrsch. f. Littgesch.* 2: 1–89), which contains bibliography and a history of the poetics of the century; Blankenburg, as noted above, § 2. Braitmaier is the chief authority. His work should be studied carefully, in order to gain a knowledge of the circumstances attending the birth of German criticism. His references to Ode, Epic, and Drama will afford clues to the discussion of these types by the German critics of the eighteenth century. For citations of Horace during this period see the footnotes to the text of the Ars Poetica in J. Bintz's Der Einfluss der Ars Poetica des Horaz auf die deutsche Literatur des XVIII. Jahrhs. (Progr. Hamburg: 1892).

German literary criticism practically begins in this century with the polemical quarrel, frequently descending to an acrimonious interchange of personalities, between the romantic Swiss School of Bodmer, J. J. Breitinger, and others, on the one hand, and the neo-classic, rule-giving School of Gottsched on the other hand. The Swiss critics "pointed out the vanity of the existing French school of German poets and critics, and attacked the accepted authorities on German art." This involved an attack upon Gottsched and the Saxon School, which was returned in good earnest.

Little, however, is said about the theory of the lyric. Bodmer's critical weekly, *Diskurse der Maler* (1721–23), is inclined to the discussion of poetry in general. Slight attention is paid to the various types. So far as the ode is concerned there is little else than a repetition of the famous *locus* in Boileau. For other periodicals that followed the *Diskurse*, see Braitmaier, 1: 40 ff. Gottsched, with his pseudo-classicism, relying upon the French and the Ancients, follows Scaliger and Boileau in the treatment of the lyric (see the second part of his Versuch einer kritischen Dichtkunst, etc., 1730; cf. Braitmaier, 1: 108–110; Grucker, 438 ff.). On Gottsched, see the references given under his name both below, §§ 6, 9, and also by Gayley and Scott, § 20. The Bremer Beiträge (*Neue Beiträge zum Vergnügen des Verstandes und Witzes.* 1744 ff.) have but little criticism, and nothing on the lyric, though many lyric poems are contained in the various numbers. J. F. von Bielfeld's L'érudition universelle, ou analyse abrégée de toutes les sciences, des beaux-arts, et des belles-lettres (4 vols. Berlin: 1768. English trans. by W. Hooper, The Elements of Universal Erudition, etc. 3 vols. Lond.: 1770) contains a conventional account of the various types, with much quotation of Boileau and Voltaire.

The second half of this century is the age of Goethe and Schiller, the Classical Period of German literature. The criticism which accompanies this period is philosophical in character, and achieves its main development in the next century (for notice see below). Goethe's fragmentary utterances on the lyric belong partly to the close of the eighteenth century and partly to the first thirty years of the nineteenth century. Attention should be given not only to his major writings but to his book reviews, maxims and reflections, to Über den sogenannten Dilettantismus, and to the Noten und Abhandlungen zum West-östlichen Divan: Dichtarten, Naturformen der Dichtung. In this last, lyric, epic, and drama are regarded as the three original and natural forms of poetry. In the notice of Manzoni's *Adelchi* (1827), it is pointed out that the lyric entices the reader into participation with the subject or situation, whereas in pragmatic (epic and dramatic) poetry the hearer need only keep himself in a state of lively receptivity. Other scattered remarks will be found in Wilhelm Meister and Dichtung und Wahrheit; see also Eckermann's Conversations with Goethe. On Goethe's literary criticism in general, see Gayley and Scott, pp. 314–317. For Herder, see above, § 2. Examples of the German philosophical works on aesthetic, of the numerous Theorien der schönen Wissenschaften written during the last quarter of the 18th century, are listed in Blankenburg, Art. Aesthetik. Among others the following contain typical remarks upon the lyric: J. A. Eberhard, Theorie der schönen Wissenschaften (Halle: 1783; 3d ed. 1789), p. 262; J. J. Eschenburg, Entwurf einer Theorie und Litteratur der schönen Wissenschaften (Berlin: 1783; another ed. 1789), Pt. VII; C. Meiners, Grundriss der Theorie und Geschichte der schönen Wissenschaften (Lemgo: 1787), Chap. XVIII; K. H. Heydenreich, System der Aesthetik (Leipz.: 1790), pp. 269, 317. Richter, Engel, and Mendelssohn are noted above, § 2.

C. *The Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries.*

See Gayley and Scott, pp. 425–428; Saintsbury, vol. III, Bk. VIII, Chap. III, Bk. IX, Chap. IV; E. Wolff, Ueber neuere Beiträge z. Gesch. d. Poetik (in *Archiv. f. Gesch. d. Philos.* 4: 251). A brief introduction to the speculative, inductive, and psychological poetics of this century will be found in pp. 10–40 of Lehmann's Poetik, cited below. On the aesthetic philosophy of Schelling, Hegel, Schopenhauer, Herbart, Zimmermann, Solger, Rosenkranz, Carriere, Hartmann, and others, see Chaps. XII–XIV of Bosanquet's History of Aesthetic 2d ed. Lond.: 1904).

In the latter part of the 18th century occurred, as already noted, the Classical Period of German literature and criticism, the period of Lessing, Schiller, Goethe, Herder, and Richter. In this period, and the first fifty or seventy-five years of the 19th century, the rule-criticism of the previous poetics, with its monotonous discussions of function and technique, is superseded by a criticism of greater insight that endeavors to philosophize upon the essential nature of poetry and its various kinds. The general influence of

Alexander Baumgarten, Gellert, Kant, Fichte, Hegel, and Schopenhauer upon the development of this philosophical criticism should be noted (see references in Gayley and Scott, pp. 423–427). But though a widening of the scope of criticism is effected, such criticism is vitiated to no slight extent by *a priori* deduction and by a repetition of philosophical commonplaces that can be compared only with the endless repetition of the 'tags' of formal Renaissance criticism. The idea of the lyric is first deduced from the author's general philosophical prepossession. Its nature is then distinguished from the epic as subjective instead of objective; concerned with the present rather than the past; having its source in feeling, not in events; revealing the personality of the poet, whereas the epic bard is lost in anonymity; presenting eternity in a moment, and not, as in the epic, ranging through a long series of deeds; suggesting the universal in the individual rather than in a group or society; approximating music rather than history; etc., etc. In a somewhat similar manner, the lyric is distinguished from the drama. The drama, for instance, must be made to appear as concerned with the future, since the lyric has already occupied "the present" and the epic, "the past." Such a triad philosophical generalization was unable to resist; and the process of reasoning was only too easy. In the drama each scene, each act, takes place in the present; but its final significance is not in the present, it is prospective: ergo, the drama is concerned with the future. But the distinction from the epic is not so clear after all. For epic suspense, although it occurs in connection with past events, also casts forward to a future. Moreover the "present" time of the drama is but an ideal present, achieved by illusion; and a similar illusion of ideal time is achieved in the epic: the reader looks toward the "future" contained in the next book or canto, just as the play-goer looks to the next scene or act. For further comparisons of lyric and drama consult the references given below.

The last quarter of the century witnesses the application of inductive method and evolutionary principles to the study of literature, — an attempt to create a science of literature. Several historico-philosophical works had already employed a semi-scientific method (e.g. those of Rosenkranz, Wackernagel, Carriere). To this kind of study Scherer's Poetik gave an impetus: it emphasized the psychological bases of literary investigation. Others, like Du Prel and Geiger (see § 2), elaborated the psychology of the lyric — still somewhat theoretical. Bruchmann and Wolff developed the theory of literary evolution. Since the scientific method necessarily leads away from theoretical discussion, we shall note its achievements elsewhere (see section on the historical study of the lyric in the nineteenth century, below, § 6, XIII, F). In the list that follows the student will note a variety of minor essays that are composite in method (Lehmann's Poetik, for example), or fragmentary in purpose (the majority), or dilettante and polemical (Holz and Honegger). For the more important works, see above, § 2.

On A. W. Schlegel's Vorlesung über das Sonett (1803) see Welti's Gesch. d. Sonettes, p. 241 ff. K. W. F. Solger, Vorlesungen über die Aesthetik (Leipz.: 1829), p. 298 ff. Solger was the forerunner of the romantic school of poetics (see Gayley and Scott, pp. 118, 424). The important Aesthetics of Hegel, Schelling, Schopenhauer, Vischer, and others are noted above, § 2. K. Rosenkranz, Die Poesie und ihre Geschichte: Eine Entwicklung der poetischen Ideale der Völker (Königsberg: 1855), — historical in method and arrangement, but philosophical (Hegelian) in its underlying idea and purpose. Material on the lyric must be gleaned from the various historical divisions. On the general theory of the work, see Gayley and Scott, p. 427. R. Zimmermann, Allgemeine Aesthetik (2 vols. 1858–65), § 582 ff. C. Lemcke, Aesthetik (1st ed. 1865; 6th ed., Leipz.: 1890). H. Baumgart's Handbuch der Poetik (Stuttgart: 1887) contains comparatively little on the lyric, and that mostly in connection with Lessing's definition of poetry as given in the Laocoön; the method is philosophical. W. Scherer's Poetik (Berlin: 1888) has little on the lyric, because of its lack of determinate unity as a type (pp. 245, 252); cf. the letter cited in the Anhang (296–297), which suggests that lyric and drama are the two *Urphänomena*, whereas the epic stands between them and may be partly lyrical, partly dramatic. Werner's Lyrik und Lyriker (cited above, § 2) is an attempt to apply Scherer's psychological method to the study of the type. H. Viehoff, Die Poetik auf der Grundlage der Erfahrungsseelenlehre (Trier: 1888),

— philosophical and psychological, but the handling of the lyric is of a piece with the usual philosophical treatment. See p. 470 ff. for principles of division and for classification of the lyric. Karl Elze, in Chaps. XI and XII of the Grundriss der englischen Philologie (2d ed. Halle: 1889), distinguishes the style and metres of the lyric from those of other types. V. Valentin, Die Dreiteiligkeit in der Lyrik (in *Zeitschr. f. vergl. Littgesch.*, N. F., II (1889), 9). P. Heinze and R. Goette, Deutsche Poetik (Dresden: 1891): for Werner's criticism of the authors' classification of the lyric, see *Jahresb. für neuere deutsche Littgesch.*, vol. II, I, 3: 45. J. J. Honegger, Das deutsche Lied der Neuzeit, etc. (Leipz.: 1891), — descriptive and superficial. O. Harnack, Ueber Lyrik (in *Preussische Jahrbücher*, 69: 386–401. 1892). Brockhaus, Konversations-Lexikon, Art. Lyrik (Berlin: 1893). A. Biese, Lyrische Dichtung, etc. (Berlin: 1896), Chap. I; Lyrische Dichtung und neuere deutsche Lyriker (Berlin: 1896), — the nature, aesthetic enjoyment, and genesis of the lyric (Chap. I), with criticism of German lyrists. K. Busse, Ueber Lyrik und Lyriker (in *Magazin für Litt. d. In- und Auslandes*, 65: 35–47. 1896). L. Jacobowski, Die Lyrik d. Ungebildeten (in *Blätter für litt. Unterhaltung* (1896), pp. 449–452), — the popular lyric is always striving to become art-poetry (cf. Burns). J. Oertner, Betrachtungen über die deutsche Lyrik (Progr., Gross-Strehlitz: 1896). A. Thimme, Lied und Märe (Gütersloh: 1896), — characteristics of folk-poetry. W. Nef, Die Lyrik als besondere Dichtungsgattung (Diss. Zürich: 1898). O. Harnack, Ueber Lyrik, in his Essais und Studien, pp. 20–38 (Braunschweig: 1899): two modes of emotional expression, — direct statement and suggestion by images. Arno Holz, Revolution der Lyrik (Berlin: 1899), — heated polemic in favor of Holz's lyric "Telegrammstil," i.e., his long and short verses divided by caprice, depending for their effect primarily upon the idea, only secondarily upon rhythmic pattern. For replies, reviews, etc., see *Jahresb. für neuere deutsche Littgesch.*, vol. XI, I, 3: 246–251. J. K. von Hoesslin, Gedankenmelodien. Studien über die lyrischen Mittel in der Dichtung (in *Die Gegenwart*, 63: 39–42. 1903). R. Prölss, Ästhetik (3d ed. Leipz.: 1904), § 76. H. Haag, L. Uhland. Die Entwicklung des Lyrikers und die Genesis des Gedichts (Stuttgart und Berlin: 1907). Anon., Grundriss einer Methodologie der Geisteswissenschaften, etc. (Wien: 1908), — mystical. R. Lehmann, Deutsche Poetik (Muenchen: 1908): not satisfied with inductive or psychological methods taken singly, the author combines them and, viewing the problem from various angles, aims to present Poetics as the technology of art (*Kunstlehre*). W. Peper, Die lyrische Dichtung (Leipz.:

1909), — for German schools. P. Witkop, Die neuere deutsche Lyrik, vol. I (Leipz.: 1910), — a series of essays, with a brief and "thin" theoretical introduction on modern German lyrists (from von Spee to Hölderlin). The author attempts to discover in each modern German lyric poet some eternal type of humanity. For further references see the *Jahresb. für neuere deutsche Littgesch.*

VII. For **Dutch** and **Spanish** criticism, see Saintsbury, Hist. Crit. The most important guide for Spanish criticism is Menéndez y Pelayo's Historia de las ideas estéticas en España (9 vols. 2d ed. Madrid: 1890–1904). With this should be used F. Fernández y González' Historia de la crítica literaria desde Luzán hasta nuestros días (1870).

CHAPTER II

HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENT

SECTION 4. STATEMENT OF PROBLEMS; ANALYSIS

Here the student enters upon a subject hitherto surprisingly neglected. The principles of the lyric, even from the theoretic point of view, have with peculiar nonchalance been passed over by many of the most distinguished critics up to the third decade of the nineteenth century, as too vague for determination or too delicate and capricious for analysis. "Bis jetzt," according to Richard Werner, "ist die Lyrik das Stiefkind der Forschung geblieben." For the species of poetry other than the drama and the epic Aristotle could find "no name generally applicable"; his treatise accordingly limits itself to the laws of epic and tragic productions. Longinus and Proclus expatiate upon the aesthetic emotions that obtain expression in poetry, upon peculiarities of diction, imagery, and type; but they leave us no generalizations concerning the mass of Greek verse which we denominate lyrical. Horace confines himself to the laws of the epic and the conventionalities of the stage. To the secret of the *Carmina*, even of his own, he gives us no key. Quintilian considers but four of the nine lyrists of Greece, and those he criticizes from the oratorical rather than the poetical point of view. Of the lyric writers of Rome "Horatius fere solus legi dignus," and that merely because of his sweetness, his grace, and his happy audacity of figurative phrase and of diction. Still slighter hint of the reason for the charm, less suggestion of the definite principles of the lyric, is dropped by the Scholiasts, by the Italians of the Renaissance, by the Bales, Puttenhams, and Webbes. Sir Philip Sidney tells us more in two paragraphs than most of his predecessors in all their works concerning the lyric poet: "Who giveth praise, the reward of virtue to virtuous acts; who giveth moral precepts and natural problems; who sometimes raiseth up his voice to the height of the heavens, in singing the lauds of immortal God." But although he recognizes the glorious possibilities of the lyric in celebrating immortal beauty and immortal goodness, he neither defines the principle nor illustrates the kinds of the type. Such was not his purpose.

Vida, Boileau, Le Bossu, Pope, and the rest of them may be searched in vain for any discussion that may avail. Schiller and Goethe wrote about the drama but not much about the lyric. In quality and importance they deemed the lyric inferior; in manner and principle they thought it too capricious for analysis. Many of the German writers of poetics, Wackernagel, Scherer, Gottschall, and the like, derive the lyric from other types or distribute its subspecies under other divisions of poetry in various fashions and with varying degrees of unconvincingness. That no two agree is to be expected since each adopts a new principle of classification: one the subject treated of, another the method of treatment, a third the form, a fourth the purpose, and so on.

During the last hundred years in England the most sympathetic and valuable estimates of the nature and function of the lyric have been those of Wordsworth, Shelley, Browning, Matthew Arnold, and John Stuart Mill. But the radical defect of English criticism has been its disregard of the historical method of investigation. If, as will readily be granted, the lyric is difficult of definition and division on *a priori* principles, the only reasonable recourse is to its historic development. The investigations of Hegel, von Hartmann, and Vischer (see above, § 2) into the growth of the lyric as an organic member of the poetic genus and their inductions concerning the national *differentiae* of the lyric species are an invaluable contribution to literary science. Other authorities (some of more recent years) will be mentioned in the course of this chapter; suffice it here to remind the student that the only way to arrive at a just mastery of lyric forms, capabilities, and principles is not by deduction from authority, but by study of the evolution of the type.

Before the student undertakes to study the development of a type he should inform himself of the actual methods of historical research. The most common has been called the chronological method (Gayley and Scott, p. 352), but it is also descriptive, aesthetic, and sociological. It consists in arranging works of given sorts in the order of their production, in marking out more or less roughly the limits of great epochs of development, in supplying illustrative biographical details and brief, critical appraisals, and in connecting the literary phenomena more or less vaguely with the growth of various social forces, — economic, political, religious, and the like. Most of the general histories of national literature and many of those that deal with particular types or periods are of this complex mode.

Another method, often named historical or comparative, but not really scientific, consists in gathering the facts of literary history under concepts or classes deduced from philosophical, even metaphysical, generalization. This, the method of Hegel and his followers (Vischer, Carriere, etc.), may better be called the judicial, deductive, or schematic. From the conveniently removed height of a world-formula the philosopher gazes upon the facts of literature and, frequently with little first-hand investigation of their meaning, differentiation, and history, forcibly marshals them under his preconceived categories. In spite of such procrustean *Schematismus*, the philosophers of literary history have, as every student must gratefully acknowledge, supplied us with a broad outlook and with suggestions of problems and aims stimulating to inductive research. Indeed, their universal affirmatives and negatives and their logically evolved categories are the outcome of some sort of observation of literature in general, and of its relation to life, growth, law, aesthetic motive, and the ideal, and therefore, in view of the intricate interrelation of all phenomena, cannot but have some bearing — often poetic and illuminating — upon the principles of literary development.

The third method "does not dispense with the discipline of the two former, nor with the results provided by them, but, proceeding on the principles of rational sequence and organic development, it corrects defective conclusions based upon temporal sequence and formal resemblance" (Gayley and Scott, p. 352). It may properly be called inductive and comparative. It consists of two steps: collection of definitely ascertained data, and comparison of these with a view to the induction of general laws of development. To the first step belongs the multitude of monographs on literary sources and cross-influences. We have essays on the *sources* of a form, as the tercet, or of an idea, as "Where are the roses of yesterday?"; or on the *influence* of one poet upon another or upon a whole period or type, as Petrarch's influence upon the French and English lyric. The facts — dates, sources, influences — determined by this exact research supply material for an inductive study of the nature and causes of literary growth in general and also in particular periods or types. Such induction is an end in itself, and justifies the extensive labor of ascertaining and collecting details. By its help scholars may someday be able "to show that the birth, rise, culmination, and decline of literary movements are manifestations of a general law," or to point out some "tolerably permanent principle of social evolution round which the facts of literary growth and decay may be grouped."

More particularly, with reference to the growth of literary types, inductive study hopes to answer such questions as:

> Why do certain types of literature become prominent at certain epochs of history? Why should certain literary forms and ideas persist from generation to generation, or recur at intervals? Is there any law governing the order of such recurrence? What signs accompany the rise, the maturity, and the obsolescence of a given type? Does one literary type, as epic, ever pass into another, as drama, by a definite process of transformation? And, if so, what are the modifying influences which effect such a metamorphosis? Why are certain literary forms missing from certain literatures? For that matter, the doubter would ask: Are there any fixed, definite and indispensable literary types at all? And if so,

have they any inherent principle of development, any quasi-biological or genetic quality? Is it possible that their apparent 'growth' and 'change' are but the growth and change of creative genius — of successive poets — under the pressure of successive external influences, social, political, economic, international, etc.?.

For the above questions see Gayley and Scott, pp. 239–250, 266–270, 350–367. For various attempts to define and outline the scientific method see Taine, Brunetière, Hennequin, Eug. Wolff, Scherer, Posnett, Bruchmann. The works of these authors, a fuller discussion of the various methods of historical study, and bibliography of the subject as a whole may be found in Gayley and Scott, §§ 16, 17, 18, 21 A, Comparative Literature, and Historical Study of Poetry. Note especially pp. 351–353, on the three ways of approaching the subject: the Linear or Chronological, the Encyclopedic, and the Cyclic. The scientific-historical method is considered at length by C. M. Gayley in What is Comparative Literature? (*Atl. Mo.*, July, 1903, pp. 56–68); and the relation of literary science to other methods of study is discussed by the same writer in The Development of Literary Studies in the Nineteenth Century (St. Louis Congress of Arts and Sciences, Boston: 1906 — vol. III, pp. 321–353). See also Manly, Hoskins, and Biedermann.

Since study of this kind is still in its experimental stage, and consequently suffers both from confusion of hypotheses and lack of accurate knowledge of the history and import of many particulars that fall under observation, it is patent that no specific laws of development can be quoted here as generally accepted by the world of scholarship. Several, however, are cited, as worthy of the attention of the student, in the historical sections and bibliographical notices which follow. The purpose of this section is to suggest in a general way the scope of inductive inquiries into the origin and growth of the lyric. Some special problems, relating to particular literatures, periods, movements, or poets, are noted in connection with the summaries of lyric development by nationalities that make up § 6, below.

In pursuit of this plan there may be considered here:

I. The Beginnings of the Lyric.

A. *With Reference to Preceding and Succeeding Artistic and Literary Types.* 1. How, for instance, did poetry differentiate itself (historically considered) from the primitive Art of Movement — the religious, mimetic, choral and musical dance? See Spencer (First Principles, 105–109), Fiske (Cosmic Philosophy), and Gummere; further references in Gayley and Scott, pp. 266–274. Can the origin of the lyric be traced to the involuntary repetition of words and phrases by the individual when in a state of strong excitement? to the rhythmic "dilatations and contractions of the heart which are the physiological accompaniments of emotion"? Can it be traced to the work-songs of primitive peoples (Hirn)? or to the substitution of words and sense for the series of meaningless sounds of which songs originally consisted (Adam Smith, Dessoir)? Compare the theories of the origin of the art instinct, for which see Gayley and Scott, pp. 173–176.

2. How did the lyric gain an individuality distinct from other poetic types? 3. Did the lyric precede or succeed the epic? What does the history of poetry in Greece suggest? What also (for critics are somewhat prone to limit their investigations to the circle of Greek and Roman poetry) does the history of poetry among the nations of modern Europe prove? — Anglo-Saxon poetry, Old High German, Early Italian, Provençal? See references to the lyric poetry of various literatures in § 6, below. Among authorities, see Mure, ten Brink, Jebb, Jevons, Posnett. 4. Study the early poetry of any familiar literature, comparing lyric effusions with epic or dramatic in respect of *naïveté* of form, dependence upon choral assistance, use of figurative language, continuity of narrative purpose, unity of thought and feeling, persistence or duration of emotion, dependence upon 'occasional' inspiration or impulse. Note ten Brink's application of this method in his Early English Literature. 5. What part may the desire of change or novelty have played in the substitution of lyric for epic (or *vice versa*), as the popular form of poetry? 6. Differentiate the impersonal *Volkslyrik* from the personal art lyric. See Gummere (Origins of Poetry), A. E. Berger, and H. Grasberger. Can the art lyric anywhere be shown to have emerged from the folk song? Consider the earliest written songs of the French *trouvères* (Chambers).

An absorbing study is that of the spread of the poetry of the *troubadours* from Provençal centres through Catalonia, Aragon, Italy, northern France, and England. The methods by which in these countries lyrics of an original and natural kind succeeded the imitations of the artificial Provençal varieties afford an interesting subject for investigation.

B. *With Reference to the Historical Conditions of its Origin.* 1. In what period, for instance, of national development do we come upon the germ of the lyric? Is it when, as some say, primitive forms of regal government are passing away? when the national spirit is awakening in the establishment of colonies, and the individual is emphasized by his importance in commercial and civil relations? or when republican forms of government are being established? or when men's thoughts begin to be centred upon the present as of more importance than the heroic, or epic, past? Do we find that the germs of the lyric existed in an earlier epic period, but required new political and social conditions for their development? Or is the lyric (in the form of hymn or chant) contemporary with the earliest service of the gods, with religious enthusiasm? And does it grow toward epic consistency and narrative form according as it gradually undertakes the celebration of definite occasions, festivals, events? Does the cultivation of the lyric wait upon the cultivation of music? See Jeanroy, Paris, Mure, Jevons, Jebb, Müller, W. von Christ, and F. W. J. von Schelling (§§ 2, 5). Here also the student is warned against drawing his conclusions from the literature of one people. Let him, after acquainting himself with the facts in his own literature and in standard modern and ancient classics, go farther afield, gathering, by means of translations, as will generally be necessary, what information he may from the folk songs of Basques, Lapps, Finns, Serbs, Bulgarians, the peoples of Southern India, of China, Japan, Polynesia, from any nationality whose songs are accessible. The broader the induction the safer the conclusion. For general references, see Gayley and Scott, pp. 266–274, The Origins of Poetry; detailed references below, § 6.

2. To what historical periods does the lyric in its various forms seem to be naturally adapted? Does the personal element of the lyric, the keen sense of present interest, comport with a primitive period? or rather with one of refined habits of thought and expression? Does the art lyric flourish in an age "alike removed from the simplicity and immaturity which is content to note in its literature the direct effects of the phenomena of the outside world and no more, and from that complexity of conditions and that tendency to intellectualize emotion which characterize a time like our own" (Schelling, Book of Elizabethan Lyrics, p. x)? Is the decay of epic and drama accompanied or followed by a development in any or all literary types of lyric sentiment — of what Symonds calls the 'lyric cry'? Does the lyric demand a certain atmosphere, analogous to the 'mist of antiquity' that appears to envelop the epic? Compare above, § 2, Carriere. Do not the choral hymns of praise, of prayer, of apprehensive deprecation or of superstitious ecstasy, the popular songs of seasons and occasions, indicate a stage of civilization earlier than that which produces the thought and style of the epic? or of the personal lyric? Of what force is the argument that would exclude choral hymns from the lyric species on the ground that they are anonymous? Should such anonymous verse be denominated, as frequently, an *unconscious* production?

II. **The Principles determining the Growth of the Lyric.** These are ascertained by studies of the following kinds:

A. *Of Individual Lyrics in Process of Composition.* Light on the manner of the development of a lyric may of course be obtained from the confession of the poet or from the observation of his intimates. Burns has in some of his letters revealed something of his method of procedure; Wordsworth has given us hints in his prefaces and notes. The diaries of other poets are similarly suggestive. The study of the internal development of the lyric has been most exhaustively prosecuted by R. M. Werner (see § 2, above), who in Die Lyrik und die Lyriker quotes freely from the diary of the poet Hebbel, and illustrates with no mediocre ingenuity the process of lyrical incubation characteristic of Bürger, Uhland, Heine, and other writers. See also Sarrazin's Study of Hugo's Lyrics. The relative influence of convention and of invention upon the poet's genius is considered by Professor Gummere in an article on Originality and Convention in Literature (see above, § 3, V, D): the author suggests that convention is of greater moment in lyric production than in other kinds of poetic creation. It should be noted that the article is a criticism of Tarde's Laws of Imitation, to which the student in search of further discussion should turn.

B. *Of the Evolution of the Lyric as a Type.* By a comparison of English lyrics of each period with those of the periods immediately anterior and subsequent, the student may apprehend — tentatively — some principle of lyric evolution in England. By applying the same plan of investigation to other literatures he may acquire materials for a general induction concerning the stages of lyric growth and the principles involved. This method, the 'comparative,' adapts itself, of course, to the study of any type of literature, or of literature itself as an organism. Such investigation has been attempted by Posnett, Jacobowski, Paul Albert, Brunetière, Jeanroy, Gaston Paris, Gummere, Grasberger, E. Wolff, Veitch, Shairp, and others; of the philosophical critics, consult Hegel, Vischer, Carriere, etc. Detailed suggestions of stages of development will be found in the remarks appended to the outlines of development by nationalities, in § 6, below; but we may note here one of the attempts toward summarizing the growth of the English lyric. N. Heppel (see above, § 2, and below, § 6) suggests four stages of development, based on successive changes in the relation of the lyric to musical accompaniment: "the primitive stage in which the theme was of little importance and the language in such a crude and undeveloped state as to make the minstrel's 'romantic harp' almost a necessity for the full effectiveness of the poem; the next stage in which the subject-matter remained conventional and — though with notable exceptions — comparatively unimportant, but when words and rhythms were invested with the highest musical quality and the *formal* side of the poem was developed to the utmost; a third stage in which the subject-matter became of more importance than the words or the music; and, finally, a stage in which subject and form assumed almost equal importance and an artistic compromise was effected between the two. These four steps correspond roughly to the four general divisions into which it is convenient and customary to divide our national literature as a whole: the Pre-Elizabethan, the Elizabethan, the Classical, and the Romantic (including the Neo-Romantic) periods" (p. 2).

C. An examination, as has already been implied, into the *Influences which have Modified the Lyric* will assist the student in distinguishing between variable and constant factors of development. Careful discrimination should, therefore, be made between principles of growth that are common to all kinds of art, — tendencies that uniformly succeed definite causes, — and more uncertain movements produced by the idiosyncrasy of the lyric poet, by the temper of his time in matters linguistic, artistic, social, political, philosophical, scientific, by peculiar climatic or geographical conditions, and by the ephemeral reflex of foreign influence. Note, for instance, the modification of English lyric poetry in the second half of the thirteenth century under French and Latin influences (ten Brink); and the decline of the Spanish poetry of chivalry during the age of Charles V under the dreamy and sensuous influences imported from Italy (*Ed. Rev.*, 40: 443). The successive influences that determine the fashions of lyric diction furnish a particularly attractive field of study. Can the investigation of the lyric literature of various nations reveal any common order in the succession of such influences, or any other general laws explanatory of fashions in diction?

III. **Tendencies of the Lyric.** The Asiatic lyric is not of the same temper, fire, or spirit as the European. The Hebraic tone of emotional exaltation and the Hellenic differ in quality; and in racial characteristic the Hebrew lyric, the Hindoo, the Japanese, are as distinct, the one from the other, as the Celtic and the

Finno-Hungarian. Also in lyrical expression stocks and groups of a common characteristic vary as widely from stocks and groups of another as constellations of southern skies from those of northern. Tendencies of spirit should be traced, and tendencies of national development; and, within the lyric anthology of a single nation, tendencies at one time toward religious themes, at another toward secular, or didactic, or aesthetic. For the lyric of one century may sing of nature and the innate simplicity of the human heart, whereas the lyric of the last sang of manners; but the century to come may sing of social brotherhood or of the sanctity of treaties, or the league to enforce peace. Such tendencies in a national literature must be noted, and their causes ascertained. The English lyric, for example, is largely a song of God and of Nature; the French of man and manners; the Chinese of peace and the domestic affections; the Japanese of the seasons and a rich melancholy. The philosophy of Nature which manifests itself in English poetry from Beowulf to the Excursion may be studied historically. The evolution of this philosophy from a stage of "confused personality of animate and inanimate" to a stage of spiritual communion between man and Nature, through varying moods, is the key to one principle of the English lyric. Tendencies of national thought and emotion color the lyric no less than other types of poetry; and call for careful discrimination on the part of the historical investigator.

IV. **Kinds of the Lyric.**

A. The *differentiation* here may be attempted in respect of form or of content, but in either case it should be conducted as a sequence of a principle of growth already determined. If the principle of development in metre, rhythm, stanzaic form, etc., be from the irregular to the conventional, or from the conventional to the artistic, the kinds of the lyric should illustrate the stages of the development. If the essential principle of lyric growth is the expression of personality in its development, or of emotion increasingly ideal, universal, aesthetic, the kinds again must follow the steps of the process.

Another basis of classification is that adopted by Werner (Lyrik, etc., pp. 138–188, 246, 248). It may be called the static. It is 'comparative,' not as following the historic development of the type, but the *radii* of the poet's environment. Having divided the lyric psychologically into lyrics of direct and of indirect expression, and the former into the emotional and the reflective species, Werner proceeds by a method of kaleidoscopic permutations and combinations to illustrate 256 cross-sections or hybrids of the "direct emotional." Of the "direct reflective" he evolves 130 mongrels more, then adds to these some 128 phenomena of the "indirect": grand total of species, 514, — more or less. The *modus operandi* of this series in Teutonic progression is, of course, as simple as the differential calculus and delightfully remunerative. You feel something — say, love; then you divide the emotion into as many forms as an isolated individual can achieve; then you multiply the sum of these by the sum of the possible complications of the individual's *historic period*; then, allowing *one* for his nationality, *three* for his rank, and *one* for his *locale*, you multiply your former result by five. The outcome is the grand total of the shades of love-lyric of which you are capable. If you are unfortunate enough to experience another emotion — or fifteen others as Dr. Werner did — you just keep on multiplying. If you should prefer a "reflection," you renew the process from the outset. To obtain an "indirect experience" you must multiply the sum total of your emotional and reflective combinations by two. And so on. In a review of his own work, in the *Jahresberichte f. neuere deutsche Litteraturgeschichte*, Bd. I, Halbbd. I, pp. 22–23, Dr. Werner compares his minute classification to the botanist's systematic arrangement of plants, and defends it on the ground that it is the only method by which a sufficiently comprehensive survey of the lyric may be obtained. Minute differentiation, he thinks, must precede and lay the basis for wide generalization. We may add that he rejects the common division into folk lyric and individual lyric, or art lyric, maintaining that every lyric of whatever time is the outcome of the feeling of an individual poet. Compare Geiger's criticism of Werner, noted above, § 2, under Geiger; see also, under § 2, the note on Werner. For another attempt at differentiation see Moulton, Modern Study of Literature, p. 197 ff.

B. *Special Forms or Differentiations*. The history of the Elegy is outlined at some length, the history of the Hymn, Epigram, and Ode at less length, in § 6, below (*Elegy*, § 6, XXXIV, A; *Hymn*, § 6, IV; XI, G; XIII, D–G; *Epigram*, § 6, XXXIV, B; *Ode*, § 6, XXXIV, C). Brief notes on the Sonnet and Song are also included in the same section (§ 6, XXXIV, D, E), with which may be compared the notices above, § 1, IV, D, A.

SECTION 5. GENERAL REFERENCES

The student need not be surprised to note how few books have aimed to cover the whole history of the lyric. The subject is too vast to engage a modern scholar. Only an encyclopedist like Quadrio could venture upon such a task, — and that in the naïveté of his age of scholarship. In the following list will be found the titles principally of works that treat at length or touch suggestively some of the broader comparative and evolutionary aspects of the historical problem. The treatment is often only suggestive. Detailed, historical discussion of the lyric is necessarily confined to works dealing with particular authors, periods, or movements; and such works, legion in number and diverse in aim and method, are noticed in the chapter following this. There they are grouped according to their particular subjects, so as to indicate methods and materials contributory to an outline of the historical development of the type. For histories of literature see the Appendix; here are noted only a few of the larger and more important of these, such as the works of Christ, Ebert, Manitius, Teuffel, Müller, and Mure.

ALLEN, P. S. Mediæval Latin Lyrics. In *Mod. Philol.*, 5: 423 ff.; 6: 55 ff.; cf. 3: 411.

On a possible Latin origin of the *Minnesang*. The author holds that the German lyric may be traced to Latin origins (compare

Jeanroy and Gaston Paris, who find its origin in imitations of the French; also Courthope, who finds the origin in Arabian court-poetry; also below, § 6, XIII, The German Lyric, where further references on the origin of the *Minnesang* may be found). The article is well annotated, and is worthy of careful study.

ALLEN, W. F., and Others. Slave Songs of the United States. N.Y.: 1867.

A suggestion of the way in which songs arise among primitive peoples may be gained from the slave-songs and 'shouts' of the American negro. The student should consult the following references: T. W. Higginson, in the *Atlantic Monthly*, June, 1867; Address delivered by J. Miller McKim, in Sumner Hall, Philadelphia, July 9, 1862; *New England Magazine*, 19: 443, 609, 707; *Independent*, 55: 1723; *Craftsman*, 23: 660; H. E. Kriebel, Afro-American Folksongs; W. E. Barton, Hymns of Slaves and Freedmen, Old Plantation Hymns, Recent Negro Melodies.

AUSFELD, F. Die deutsche anakreontische Dichtung des 18. Jhdts. In *Quellen und Forschungen*, No. 101. 1907.

Relation of German anacreontic verse to French, Latin, and Greek anacreontics.

AUST, J. Beiträge zur mittelenglischen Lyrik. In *Herrig's Archiv*, 70: 253 ff.

The characteristics of ecclesiastical lyric and secular lyric in their earliest forms, and their reciprocal influence.

BAUMGART, H. Handbuch der Poetik. Stuttgart: 1887.

Learned, trustworthy, and exhaustive.

BEERS, H. A. Points at Issue and Some Other Points. N.Y.: 1904.
Pp. 183–211 The English Lyric.

A sketch of the development of the English lyric from the Elizabethan song lyrics to the modern art lyric. Compare N. Hepple, above, § 2 and p. 145.

BERGER, A. E. Volksdichtung und Kunstdichtung. In *Nord und Süd*, 68: 76–96 (1894).

An examination of earlier attempts at differentiating folk poetry and art poetry (Herder, Arnim, Brentano, Grimm Brothers), with a finding against their methods. The author would differentiate the two on the basis of means of perpetuation, — the former by oral tradition, the latter by writing. Cf. J. Meier, below.

BERNHARDY, G. Grundriss der griechischen Litteratur.

See above, § 2.

BIEDERMANN, FREIHERR W. VON. Zur vergleichenden Geschichte der poetischen Formen. In *Zeitschr. für vergleich. Littgesch.*, N.F., 2: 415. 1889.

BIESE, A. Griechische Lyriker.

See above, § 2.

BLACKIE, J. S. Scottish Song. Edinb. and Lond.: 1889.

Beginning with the *Volkslied*, the editor gives examples of love-songs, war-songs, songs of character, drinking-songs, songs of the sea, of thought, of sentiment, with a running commentary of unusual interest. See also Shairp, § 2, above.

BLANKENBURG, F. VON. Litterarische Zusätze zu J. G. Sulzer's Allgemeine Theorie, etc.

See above, § 2, under Sulzer, J. G.

BOECKH, A. Encyklopädie und Methodologie der philologischen Wissenschaften. 2d ed. Leipz.: 1886.

Pp. 649–684 Greek epic, lyric, drama; 710–724 Roman drama, epic, and lyric. For Boeckh's method of attack, see Gayley and Scott, §§ 2, 14. Boeckh's observations and bibliographies are still valuable.

BOVET, E. Lyrisme, épopée, drame: une loi de l'histoire littéraire expliquée par l'évolution générale. Paris: 1911.

An attempt to revive Victor Hugo's tripartite division of literary evolution into stages corresponding to the lyric, epic, and drama.

BRUCHMANN, K. Poetik. Berlin: 1898.

Pp. 108–113.

A valuable attempt in the inductive method.

BRUNETIÈRE, F. L'Évolution de la poésie lyrique en France au 19^e siècle. 2 vols. 2d ed. Paris: 1895.

See articles in *Revue Bleue*, June, etc., 1893.

A brilliant attempt to trace the evolution, as distinct from the history, of the French lyric in the century indicated in the title. Brunetière shows the peculiarly intimate relation of French lyrism to romanticism and individualism, to naturalism, and symbolism, to the novel, and, in general, to the chief philosophical and social movements of the century. Subjective and objective tendencies are alike discussed. The work is valuable for general method as well as for the handling of the particular subject with which it deals. For comment upon Brunetière's method see Gayley and Scott, pp. 251–252 *et passim* (Index); also § 2, above.

BÜCHER, K. Arbeit und Rhythmus. 4 Aufl. Leipz.: 1909.

The relation of the lyric to the rhythm of labor (work-songs) has afforded a subject of considerable discussion. See further the works by Hirn, Gummere, and Wallaschek mentioned elsewhere; also M. K. Smith, Rhythmus und Arbeit (in Wundt's *Philos. Studien*, 16: 71–34, 197–306); and Gayley and Scott, p. 272, — in general pp. 266–274 The Origins of Poetry.

Cambridge History of English Literature. Ed. by A. W. Ward and A. R. Waller. 14 vols. Lond. and N. Y.: 1907–1916.

In the various volumes will be found invaluable and up-to-date monographs upon the history of the lyric or its sub-types in particular periods, and upon the productions of the successive lyric poets. Detailed references are given below, § 6, XI.

CARDUCCI, G. Opere. 20 vols. Bologna: 1889–1909.

Vol. XVI Dello svolgimento dell' ode in Italia. In vol. XIX will be found essays on the Italian lyric of the 18th century; in vol. XVI, Primavera e fiore della lirica italiana.

The essay on the development of the ode in Italy is particularly valuable in array of material and exemplification of historical method.

Carpenter, F. I. English Lyric Poetry 1500–1700. Lond.: 1897.

The Introduction contains a brief *résumé* of English lyric poetry up to 1700, in which the discussion of lyric themes and the causes underlying the successive varieties of treatment is sensible. On p. lxiii occurs the following hint of a general characteristic of lyric growth: "Changes in form resulting from changes in spirit affect the lyric later than other literary kinds, for the reason that Form in the lyric is more important than in other kinds and consequently more tenacious and persistent."

Carriere, M. Die Poesie. 2d ed. Leipz.: 1884.

Chap. VIII, pp. 407–434 Die Lyrik in der Geschichte. Cf. above, § 2; see also Die Kunst im Zusammenhang der Culturentwickelung (also noted above, § 2).

Case, R. H. English Epithalamies. Lond.: 1896.

An anthology of English epithalamies, with a chronological list of English examples of this sub-type, and a very helpful introduction in which is sketched the history of marriage-songs from the time of the ancient Greeks to the present.

Chambers, E. K., and Sidgwick, F. Early English Lyrics, Amorous, Divine, Moral and Trivial. Lond.: 1907.

See the essay, Some Aspects of Mediæval Lyric, pp. 259–296, by Chambers; in the same author's Mediæval Stage will be found many valuable references to the growth of the early European lyric.

Professor Chambers believes that the art lyric of the *trouvère* sprang from an earlier, popular, originally communal lyric. His description of this art lyric, or *chanson courtois*, and of the *chanson populaire* that is not folk song, but rests upon folk song, and may represent an intermediate stage between it and the *chanson courtois*, is brief and stimulating. Notice the discussion of the development of the English lyric as compared with that of the French. Good bibliography.

Christ, W. von. Geschichte der griechischen Litteratur. Edited and enlarged by W. Schmid and O. Stählin. In two parts and three volumes. 5th ed. München: 1908–1913. In I. von Müller's Handbuch der klassischen Altertums-Wissenschaft.

The standard history of Greek literature from its beginnings to 530 A.D. Here the student will find the latest and most authoritative statement of the history of all the literary types, and copious references to monographs and other histories.

Cohen, H. L. The Ballade. Columbia Univ. Press. N.Y.: 1915.

An extended study of the origin, development, and criticism of the ballade; valuable bibliography. See also White, § 2, above.

Collections de contes et chansons populaires. 41 vols. Paris: 1881–1913.

For the student of comparative literature this collection of the popular poetry of all peoples — civilized, barbaric, and savage — is an empire of narrative and lyrical material.

Couat, A. La poésie alexandrine sous les trois premiers Ptolémées (324–222 B.C.). Paris: 1882.

A clear and full treatment of elegiac, lyric, epic, pastoral, idyllic, and didactic poetry of the Alexandrian age. This work should be checked with the more recent Geschichte der griechischen Litteratur of W. von Christ (see above).

Courthope, W. J. Life in Poetry: Law in Taste. Lond.: 1901.

Cf. above, § 2.

Crowest, F. J. The Story of the Carol. 1911.

Crusius, O. Elegie. In Pauly-Wissowa's Real-Encyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft, vol. V (1905), pp. 2260–2307.

This is the "most complete and only satisfactory" history of the classical elegy as a whole. It is an indispensable aid in the study of the elegy. It contains a bibliography of the most important works on the subject, summarizes ancient criticism of the elegy, and gives the history of the Greek, Hellenistic, and Roman elegy. Other discussions of Roman elegy are mentioned above, § 2, Sellar, K. F. Smith, Plessis, and below, § 6, XXXIV, A.

CUNNINGHAM, A. The Songs of Scotland, etc. 4 vols. Lond.: 1825.

The Introduction contains historical material that should be compared with the essays on minstrelsy by Percy and Ritson, critical and appreciative passages, and a series of notes on the chief Scottish song-makers.

DENNIS, J. Studies in English Literature. Lond.: 1876.

See above, § 2.

DESSOIR, M. Ästhetik und allgemeine Kunstwissenschaft. Stuttgart: 1906.

Dessoir's point of view is anthropological and psychological. In his criticism of previous theories derived from similar points of view the author very opportunely protests against some as too narrow (insufficient induction), mechanical, or uuilitarian. For example, on p. 289 ff., the theory that finds the origin of the lyric in repetition developing into rhythmical order is characterized as narrow because rhythmic order is not a later development, but an original means of creative expression. The theory that relates the origin of the lyric to labor (work-songs) is considered to be partial, incomplete (290 ff.). Of the theory that regards rhythmical expression as emotionally excited speech (Dessoir, p. 304, refers to the following supporters of the theory: Rousseau, Dubos, Spencer, Jakob Grimm, Wilhelm Jordan), the author thinks lightly because he finds that the oldest songs, like the simplest songs of children, have no text, but use a series of meaningless sounds. The manner in which a text developed from these sounds is indicated by a passage from Adam Smith, which Dessoir quotes, p. 305:

> In the succession of ages it could not fail to occur, that in the room of those unmeaning or musical words, if I may call them so, might be substituted words which expressed some sense or meaning, and

of which the pronunciation might coincide as exactly with the time and measure of the tune, as that of the musical word had done before. Hence the origin of Verse or Poetry (Works. 1811. Vol. V, p. 267).

This, of course, refers the origin of the lyric to music, rather than to speech. For further remarks on the lyric, see references listed in the index.

Duff, J. W. A Literary History of Rome. Lond.: 1909.

Du Méril, M. E. Poésies populaires latines antérieures au douzième siècle. Paris: 1843.

Du Méril, M. E. Poésies populaires latines du Moyen Age. Paris: 1847.

These two volumes by Du Méril, with texts and introductions, are helpful in tracing the development of Latin popular poetry during the Dark and Middle Ages.

Ebert, A. Allgemeine Geschichte der Literatur des Mittelalters im Abendlande bis zum Beginne des XI. Jahrhunderts. 3 vols. Leipzig: 1874–87. 2d ed. vol. I, 1889. French trans. by J. Aymeric, etc., 3 vols. Paris: 1883–89.

This standard work on the Latin literature of the Middle Ages, including early Christian Latin poetry, should be studied with the two works of Manitius (see below) covering the same general field. Ebert and Manitius are the standard guides for the student of the literary development of the Dark and Middle Ages. For an English guide to the Dark Ages see Professor Ker's admirable volume, noted below. To the Middle Ages the volumes by Saintsbury, Snell, and Smith in Saintsbury's Periods of European Literature Series afford convenient English introductions.

Edinburgh Review, 40: 443 ff. Lyric Poetry of Spain.

An excellent illustration of the manner in which, and the extent to which, one literature may affect another. The Italian qualities of the Spanish lyric during the Golden Age of Charles V are under consideration. The author shows that the alteration in the

Spanish lyrical style cannot be accounted for merely by the introduction of new forms: that a national taste in poetry must develop from within as well as by impact from without.

EGGER, É. L'Hellénisme en France. 2 vols. Paris: 1869.

Vol. I, Chaps. XV, XVI for the sixteenth-century lyric in France under classic influence; vol. II, Chap. XXVI L'Hellénisme dans les genres secondaires de la poésie française.

ERSKINE, J. The Elizabethan Lyric. A Study. N.Y.: 1903.

Compare above, § 2.

The most careful and thorough study of the nature and history of the Elizabethan lyric that has as yet appeared. The Elizabethan lyric is resolved into two chief categories: lyrics which incline to be pastoral in subject and idyllic in method; short songs, "not generally pastoral in subject, and epigrammatic, rather than idyllic, in manner." Sonnet-writing is held to have formed a transition between these two categories. The song in the drama is also considered. Throughout the book much emphasis is placed upon the varying relations of the lyric forms to practical music. The first chapter is general in nature, and differentiates lyrical quality and lyric form. Other problems of theory are also briefly treated in the same chapter. The appendix contains a chronological *résumé* of the Elizabethan lyric and a valuable bibliography.

FARNELL, G. S. Greek Lyric Poetry. Lond.: 1891.

The Prefatory Articles contain a very helpful, brief account of the Greek lyric.

FLACH, H. Geschichte der griechischen Lyrik. Tübingen: 1884.

The chief history of the Greek lyric: extensive, learned, methodical.

FLOECK, O. Die Kanzone in der deutschen Dichtung. In *Berliner Beiträge zur german. und roman. Philol. Germ. Abt.* No. 27. 1910.

FRÖBERG, T. Beiträge zur Geschichte und Charakteristik des deutschen Sonetts im 19. Jahrh. St. Petersburg: 1904.

GAUTIER, L. Les épopées françaises. 5 vols. 2d ed. Paris: 1878–1897.

P. 4. The lyric precedes the epic. See below, § 11.

GOSSE, E. Elegy.

See above, § 2.

GRASBERGER, H. Die Naturgeschichte des Schnaderhüpfls. Leipz.: 1896.

Cf., for discussion and bibliography, G. Meyer, Essays und Studien (1885), pp. 289–407; and Gummere, Beginnings of Poetry, p. 405 ff.

An admirable monograph on this type of Bavarian folk lyric, perhaps originally a reaping song. In general, the relation of the improvised folk song to the art lyric affords two theories: one, largely discredited, to the effect that the folk song is a decaying remnant of art poetry discarded by the upper classes and surviving in a rude way among the peasants (cf. G. Smith, The Transition Period, p. 182 ff.); the other to the effect that the folk lyric represents an early stage out of which the art epic grows (see Gummere, as cited above). The student should consider the *strambotti* of Italy, the *coplas* of Spain, the *stev* of the Scandinavians, etc.

GREG, W. W. Pastoral Poetry and Pastoral Drama. 1906.

An extensive, valuable, and authoritative work. Should be consulted for material on the pastoral elegy.

GRÖBER, G. Grundriss der romanischen Philologie. 2 Bde. Strassburg: 1902, etc.

Consult for historical outlines and bibliographical accounts of various romance literatures, — Medieval Latin, French, Italian, Spanish, etc. The arrangement of materials by literary kinds renders this great work particularly helpful to the student of the poetic types. For early Latin Church Hymns, see Bd. II, Abt. 1,

pp. 112, 152, 325; for early secular Latin lyric, 112, 157, 339, 415; for French lyric, 444, 475, 659, 935, 971; for Portuguese lyric, Bd. II, Abt. 2; for Spanish lyric, Bd. II, Abt. 3. For further references, see below, § 6.

GROSSE, E. The Beginnings of Art. N.Y.: 1897.

Pp. 234–250.

In this stimulating work — fruitful both in scientific method and far-reaching result — Grosse devotes one chapter to poetry among primitive races. Contrary to Spencer, who held that primitive poetry is "undifferentiated" as regards kinds, Grosse asserts that the facts show that in the poetry of the lowest culture the various kinds are "quite as independently and characteristically formed as in the highest." "It cannot, however, be denied," he goes on to say, "that the lyric of the primitive peoples contains many epic elements, and that their epic very often assumes a lyric or dramatic character. But if we should call primitive poetry undifferentiated on that account, we should have no right to contrast cultivated poetry with it as undifferentiated, for a pure lyric, epic, or dramatic poetry has never been realized anywhere." An examination of primitive lyrics leads to the statements that the mere rhythmical repetition of verbal expression of feeling and the aesthetically effective expression of the emotions are lyrical; that many of the songs are satirical; that the romantic element is almost lacking (cf. Werner in *J B L*, VI, I, 10: 79–80); that the lyrics are egoistic in character; and that for primitive society poetical meaning is of less importance than musical effect. — Must not a successful differentiation of poetic kinds (never yet accomplished) be based on an historical induction that begins with the crude songs of 'primitive' races? In them the historian may study the simplest conditions of content and outward form; following the advance of culture he may note the collateral influences which produce shades of change in content and form, — may perchance decipher the general laws of such change and, so, come to understand the principle of the origin and descent of literary species.

GRUPPE, O. F. Die römische Elegie. 2 vols. Leipz.: 1838–39.

An early treatment, somewhat appreciative and interpretative, of the Roman elegy, but involving careful historical study of the variation within the Roman type and a comparison with the Alexandrian elegy. The more critical material is contained in an extended commentary upon Tibullus and Propertius; the historical treatise is contained in Chap. XII of vol. I.

GUBERNATIS, A. DE. Storia universale della letteratura. 18 vols. in 23. Milano: 1883–85.

Vol. III Storia della poesia lirica; vol. IV Florilegio lirico.

A work of considerable value by way of orientation for the student of comparative literature. Vol. III consists of an introduction on popular lyric poetry and short sketches outlining the history of the lyric in India, China, Japan, Palestine, Arabia, Persia, Turkey, Greece, Rome, Italy, Spain, Portugal, France, England, Scandinavia, Holland, Germany, Hungary, Rumania, Russia, Poland, and Bohemia. In vol. IV are representative lyrics from these countries, presented in Italian translations.

GUMMERE, F. B. The Beginnings of Poetry. N.Y.: 1901.

Chaps. IV, VII.

In the former chapter Professor Gummere endeavors to trace the development of the European lyric from the communal stage (the impersonal *Volkslyrik*) to the personal and artistic stage. In the latter, pp. 390–422, the lyric of individual character is distinguished from the lyric of the communal dance. This process of differentiation begins with the choral horde "on a level of general, if not equal, ability to make and sing verse, preferably in the form of a single couplet or quatrain." The couplet or quatrain "is at first subordinate to the chorus of the throng, then meets it on even terms, and at last, losing its general origins and its particular individuality and coming to be a part of an artistic poem, drives the discredited chorus from the field." See also the Index, under Lyric. The book is of prime importance.

GUMMERE, F. B. Old English Ballads. Boston: 1899.

Introduction, pp. xi–xiv.

The change from the communal to the personal note as due to economic development. The influence of the invention of printing upon subjectivity in the lyric. Compare p. 147 of the work just above: "The history of modern verse, with epic and drama in decay, is mainly the history of lyrical sentiment."

HANFORD, J. H. Classical Eclogue and Medieval Debate. In *Romanic Rev.* 2: 16, 129. 1911.

On the origin of medieval *débat*.

HANFORD, J. H. The Pastoral Elegy and Milton's *Lycidas*. In *Pubs. Mod. Lang. Ass.*, 25 (New Series, 18): 403–447. Baltimore: 1910.

A brief but informing review of the relation of Milton's Lycidas to anterior pastoral elegy. The article will serve as an introduction to the history of the pastoral elegy from Theocritus to Milton.

HARTUNG, J. A. Die griechischen Elegiker. 2 vols. Leipz.: 1859.

A valuable edition of Greek and Alexandrian elegies, with introductions on the ancient Greek and Alexandrian elegy and the Alexandrian epigram, translations from the Greek originals into German, and annotations and references.

HAUPT, M. — BELGER, C. M. Haupt als academischer Lehrer. Berlin: 1879.

See the sections on Roman elegists.

HEGEL, G. W. F. *Op. cit.*, § 2.

Bd. 10, Abt. 3, pp. 466–478 Geschichtliche Entwickelung der Lyrik.

The lyric is examined as symbolic, classical, and romantic. To the 'symbolic' stage belong the lyrics of the Orient (Chinese, Indian, Hebrew, Persian, etc.). In these the lyrist maintains a negative attitude toward the surrounding process of nature. To the 'classical' stage belong the lyrics of Greece and Rome, characterized by the element of dignified self-assertion. Their form is considered (1) in Epic Hymns, (2) in Elegiacs, (3) in Iambics; and their sentiment and passion, as developed (1) in Melic Songs, (2) in Chorals, (3) in Alexandrine Poetry. Roman lyric poetry follows in due course. Finally is considered the romantic lyric, characterized by the modern spirit of Teutons, Celts, and Slavs. This romantic stage gives us: (1) the lyric of pagan characteristics, (2) the lyric of medieval Christianity, (3) the lyric of Protestantism.

HERDER, J. G.

See above, § 2, and below, § 11.

HERFORD, C. H. The Literary Relations of England and Germany in the Sixteenth Century. Cambridge Univ. Press: 1886.

Pp. 1–20 Lyrics. Cf. G. Waterhouse, The Literary Relations of England and Germany in the Seventeenth Century (Cambridge: 1914).

HINNEBERG, P. (ed.) Die Kultur der Gegenwart, ihre Entwickelung und ihre Ziele.

Die orientalischen Literaturen. T. 1: 7. 1906; Die griechische und lateinische. T. 1: 8. 1905. 2d ed. 1912; Die osteuropäischen. T. 1: 9. 1908; Die romanischen. T. 1: 11: 1. 1909.

A recent, authoritative work, which gives in its articles on literary history up-to-date reviews of the national literatures of modern Europe, classical antiquity, and the Orient. The sections on Greek and Celtic literature, by U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff and Heinrich Zimmer respectively, will be found especially helpful. Brief bibliographical notes are appended to all sections.

HIRT, H. Die Indogermanen. 2 vols. Strassburg: 1905–1907.

Vol. II, p. 472 ff.

HOSKINS, J. P. Biological Analogy in Literary Criticism. In *Modern Philology*, 6: 407–434; 7: 61–82.

Hugo, V. Preface to "Cromwell."

Hugo distinguishes three successive literary types — lyric, epic, and drama — corresponding to three great historical periods, the primitive, antique, and the modern. For a criticism of the grandiloquent assertion of the priority of the lyric, see Posnett, Comparative Literature, pp. 152–155; for a recent resuscitation of Hugo's threefold historical-literary division, see above, Bovet.

Jacoby, F. Zur Entstehung der römischen Elegie. In *Rheinisches Museum*, 60: 38–105 (1905).

Was the subjective erotic elegy of Tibullus and Propertius a descendant of an Alexandrian erotic elegy, or was it an original Roman development from the Hellenistic erotic epigram? Jacoby argues for the second hypothesis. Compare below, § 6, xxxiv, a, The Roman Elegy; see also an article by A. Mess (*Rhein. Mus.*, 63: 488 ff. 1908), which endeavors to derive the subjective erotic form from Catullus 68.

Jacoby, F. Anthologie aus den Elegikern der Römer. 2d ed. Leipz.: 1895.

A brief historical introduction deals with the elegy.

Jantzen, H. Geschichte des deutschen Streitgedichtes im Mittelalter. In *Germanistische Abhandlungen*, No. 13. 1896.

Comparison with similar poems of other nations.

Jasinski, M. Histoire du Sonnet en France. Paris: 1905.

See the review by R. Doumic, in *Revue des Deux Mondes*, March 15, 1904 (p. 444 ff.).

Jeanroy, A. Les origines de la poésie lyrique en France au moyen âge. 2d ed. Paris: 1904.

Compare J. Bédier, Les fêtes de mai et les commencements de la poésie lyrique au moyen âge (in *Rev. d. Deux Mondes*, May 1, 1896).

This is the best work on the early French lyric. In the first part, the various forms of the north French medieval lyric are described, and the theories of their origin discussed. The second part applies the comparative method of study to the question of origins by endeavoring to recover the lost original forms of French lyric poetry from the supposed imitations of those forms in the lyric literature of other European nations.

> Le principe sur lequel nous nous appuierons est simple: chaque fois que nous trouverons un thème poétique dans un pays ayant imité notre poésie lyrique, et, en France, une allusion, un fragment se rapportant à ce thème, nous nous croirons autorisés à conclure, non point qu'il est né en France, mais qu'il a été traité aussi. Si nous ne trouvons point de textes qui s'y rapportent dans la poésie française du XII^e^ et du XIII^e^ siècles, mais que nous en trouvions dans celle du XIV^e^ ou du XV^e^, ayant un caractère nettement populaire, c'est-à-dire n'ayant pu venir en France de l'extérieur, nous penserons pouvoir tirer la même conclusion (p. 126).

The third part contains a description of the versification of the lyrics. Bibliographical material will be found on pages ix–xiii and 515–527. Gaston Paris has pointed out (p. 3 of his Les origines de la poésie lyrique en France au moyen âge: see below) that perhaps the most important idea of the book is that which connects the lyric poetry of the Middle Ages with the spring *fêtes* and dances (p. 387 ff. of Jeanroy).

JESPERSEN, J. Progress in Language. Lond.: 1894. In part a translation of a Danish work of 1891.

§ 279 ff. Song antedates language; cf. § 264 ff.

JEVONS, F. B. A History of Greek Literature from the Earliest Period to the Death of Demosthenes. Lond.: 1886.

P. 106.

Jevons traces the influence of political and social conditions in Greece upon the development of the lyric. He wisely, however, refrains from extending his conclusions to the history of the lyric in countries where different conditions have obtained. The lyric of Greece he regards as more occasional, less universal, than the modern lyric.

JULIAN, J. A Dictionary of Hymnology. 1892. Rev. ed. 1907.

A dictionary of hymns of all ages and nations, with a set of essays on subjects pertaining to hymnology.

KER, W. P. The Dark Ages. Lond. and N.Y.: 1904.

Cf. Ebert above, Manitius below.

LENTZNER, C. A. Über das Sonett und seine Gestaltung in der englischen Dichtung bis Milton. Halle: 1886. See also § 2, Tomlinson, Watts-Dunton, Noble.

LES LITTÉRATURES POPULAIRES DE TOUTES LES NATIONS. 45 vols. Paris: 1881–1902.

An admirable series of carefully edited texts of the popular literatures of many peoples and dialect-divisions. The introductions are of value, and the student who acquaints himself with some fraction of this wide range of tales and poems has taken a long stride toward acquainting himself with the subject and problems of popular literature. It is difficult to come across a complete list of the volumes, but the book catalogues of Lorenz from 1881 on afford the necessary information.

LETOURNEAU, C. L'Évolution littéraire dans les diverses races humaines. Paris: 1894.

Superficial, but suggestive.

LEVY, P. Geschichte des Begriffes Volkslied. In *Acta Germanica*, 7, 3. Berlin: 1911.

See the review in the *Literaturblatt f. germ. u. roman. Phil.*, 34: 1.

LLOYD, M. Elegies: Ancient and Modern. Trenton, New Jersey: 1903.

A volume of representative selections (the foreign poems in English versions) from the whole course of elegiac poetry up to Dryden and Congreve. It is prefaced by a short review of the history of elegy, — a superficial summary of names and titles rather than a study of the variation of the type.

LONGFELLOW, H. W. The Poets and Poetry of Europe: With introduction and biographical notes. New ed. Phila.: 1871.

This volume is of material assistance in the historical study of the lyric. It contains translations not only of the songs, but of the ballads and epic-fragments of the Anglo-Saxon, Icelandic, Danish, Swedish, German, Dutch, French, Italian, Spanish, and Portuguese languages. The historical and critical prefaces by Longfellow give in concise and popular form information sufficient to acquaint the beginner with the subject.

MACKAIL, J. W. Lectures on Poetry. Lond.: 1911.

P. 93 ff. Arabian Lyric Poetry; p. 179 ff. Shakespeare's Sonnets; p. 231 ff. The Poetry of Oxford; p. 281 ff. Keats.

MACKAIL, J. W. Select Epigrams from the Greek Anthology. Lond.: 1890.

See above, § 2.

MACKENZIE, A. S. The Evolution of Literature.

See below, § 11.

MAHAFFY, J. P. History of Classical Greek Literature. 2 vols. N.Y.: 1880.

Vol. I The Poets.

MANITIUS, M. Geschichte der christlich-lateinischen Poesie bis zur Mitte des 8. Jahrhunderts. Stuttgart: 1891.

MANITIUS, M. Geschichte der lateinischen Literatur des Mittelalters. Erster Teil: von Justinian bis zur Mitte des zehnten Jahrhunderts. In I. von Müller's Handbuch der klassischen Altertums-Wissenschaft. München: 1911.

These two standard works of Manitius should constantly be at the hand of every student of the development of a literary type in Latin during the Dark and Middle Ages. For other guides see above, under Ebert.

MANLY, J. M. Literary Forms and the New Theory of the Origin of Species. In *Modern Philology*, 4: 577–595.

A suggestive attempt to explain the origin of mysteries, miracle-plays, and moralities in the light of De Vries' Mutation Theory. The method might be extended to other literary types.

Martinengo-Cesaresco, Countess E. Essays in the Study of Folk-Songs. Lond.: 1886.

Martinon, Ph. Les strophes, étude historique et critique sur les formes de la poésie lyrique en France depuis la Renaissance. Paris: 1912.

An exhaustive study of the development of a poetic type must include an analysis of the successive variations in the verse technique of the type. The analysis of variations in the development of modern lyrical forms from the prosodical patterns of the Middle Ages, affords a most important, as well as clear and objective, subject of study. For the French portion of this field, especially significant because of the great influence of Provençal poetry in the general provenience of the European lyric, welcome guides are Kastner's History of French Versification and F. de Gramont's Les vers français et leur prosodie. Further references will be found in Gayley and Scott, pp. 506–509; and see below, § 6, vii The French Lyric, b The Troubadours. But the present work by Ph. Martinon is particularly welcome for its contribution to the history of stanzaic forms, both in the general *résumé* of French strophic development contained in the introduction, and in the careful inductions from the numerous examples cited in the various divisions of the work. Especially interesting is the author's contention (pp. 8–20) that to Clément Marot, and not to Ronsard, is due the credit for making over the medieval lyric into a modern instrument. He writes:

> Ainsi Marot, avant de mourir, a préparé à ses successeurs l'instrument définitif du lyrisme moderne. C'était un instrument fait de pièces anciennes, mais les pièces seulement étaient anciennes, l'agencement ne l'était pas: l'instrument était tout neuf, et il sert encore. D'autres sauront en tirer de plus beaux sons, mais ce sera toujours le même instrument: ils ajouteront peut-être quelques cordes à la harpe, mais ce sera toujours la même harpe (p. 20).

MASSON, G. La lyre française. New ed. Lond.: 1892.

The Preface, Notes, and Chronological Index, to say nothing of the excellent anthology, furnish helpful material to a student beginning his acquaintance with the French lyric.

MATTHEWS, B. American Familiar Verse. N.Y.: 1904.

The introduction outlines the history of familiar verse from Anacreon to the present. See also Locker-Lampson (above, § 2), A. Lang's Letters on Literature (noted above, § 3), etc.

MEIER, J. Kunstlied und Volkslied in Deutschland (Halle: 1906); Kunstlieder im Volksmunde, Materialien und Untersuchungen (Halle: 1906).

For a review of these works, see *Literaturbl. f. germ. u. roman. Phil.* 1908, No. 12. Cf. A. E. Berger, above.

MILLER, G. M. The Historical Point of View in English Literary Criticism from 1570–1770. In *Anglistische Forschungen*, No. 35. 1913.

MOORMAN, F. W. William Browne, and the Pastoral Poetry of the Elizabethan Age. Strassburg: 1897.

MOTHERWELL, W. Minstrelsy, Ancient and Modern. 2 vols. Boston: 1846.

Introduction.

MOULTON, R. G. The Modern Study of Literature. 1915.

See above, § 2.

MÜLLER, K. O. History of the Literature of Ancient Greece. Trans. by G. Lewis. New ed. London.: 1847.

Pp. 16–22.

The lyric as the earliest expression of religious enthusiasm. Its consequent development in connection with the necessities and the festivities of primitive life. See also for history of the various literary types in Greece.

MURE, W. Critical History of the Language and Literature of Ancient Greece. 2d ed. 5 vols. Lond.: 1854.

Vol. I, pp. 170–172; Vol. III, pp. 2–5.

Mure insists upon the priority of epic to lyric, but the reasons which he assigns do not prove that the beginnings of lyric poetry are later than those of epic. His generalizations on the respective characteristics of the types are invalidated by an evident desire to make his point. It would hardly be safe, nowadays, to assert, as he did, that no anonymous lyric has come down to us. With regard to some of the principles of artistic evolution, however, and the parallel courses of music and lyric poetry, this discussion is informing and trustworthy. — See also for history of the various literary types in Greece.

NEILSON, W. A. Origins and Sources of the Court of Love. 1900.

NICKEL, W. Sirventes und Spruchdichtung. In *Palaestra*, No. 63. 1907.

A general account focused upon the German forms.

NISARD, C. Des chansons populaires chez les anciens et chez les Français. 2 vols. Paris: 1867.

An attempt to trace the history of popular songs among the Greeks, Romans, and French. Special attention is paid to the *chansonniers*, or bacchanalian songs, to songs of love, and to songs of war. The student should check the work with more recent monographs dealing with the same and similar subjects (cf. below, § 6, VII, K; VIII, A, J; XIII, H; etc.).

OLIPHANT, T. A Short Account of Madrigals. 1836.

For other references on the madrigal see under W. A. Barrett as noted below, § 6, XI, C, References.

OLMSTEAD, E. W. The Sonnet in French Literature and the Development of the French Sonnet Form. Cornell Diss. Ithaca, N. Y.: 1897.

Ouvré, H.

Op. cit. § 11.

Notice the contrast between the discursive and divergent development of the Greek lyric and the unity of development of the Greek epic (p. 61 ff.). Is this contrast real or apparent?

Palgrave, F. T. Essay on Spenser's Minor Poems. In vol. IV of Spenser's Complete Works, Ed. by A. B. Grosart, 10 vols., privately printed, 1882–1884.

Paris, Gaston. Les origines de la poésie lyrique en France au moyen âge. Paris: 1892. (Extraits du *Journal des Savants* — novembre et décembre 1891, mars et juillet 1892.)

A critique of Jeanroy's Poésie lyrique en France (see above). Pp. 1–6 contain a brief summary and general criticism of Jeanroy's book. The rest of the essay supplements the first part of Jeanroy's work with historical and literary material not used in that work. In the course of the essay Paris supports the thesis,— "la poésie des troubadours proprement dite, imitée dans le Nord à partir du milieu du XII^e siècle, et qui est essentiellement la poésie courtoise, a son point de départ dans les chansons de danses et notamment de danses printanières, . . ." (p. 58). See the same author's La poésie du moyen âge (2 vols. 1885–95; vol. I, 5th ed., vol. II, 3d ed., 1903–06), La litt. fr. au moyen âge, XI^e–XIV^e siècle (5th ed. 1914), and Mélanges de litt. fr. du moyen âge, Ed., M. Roques (Paris: 1912). For a list of the works of this most important writer upon medieval French lyric and epical poetry, see J. Bédier et M. Roques, Bibliographie des travaux de Gaston Paris (Paris: 1904).

Paul, H. Grundriss der germanischen Philologie. 2d ed. 3 vols. in 4. Strassburg: 1900–1909. 3d ed. begun 1911.

Cf. Gayley and Scott, Index.

Consult Bd. II, Abt. I for history and bibliography of the Germanic literatures: Gothic, German (from the beginnings to the Middle Low German period inclusive), Dutch (up to the

17th century), Frisian (through 19th century), Norwegian-Icelandic and Swedish-Danish (through Middle Ages), and Anglo-Saxon. An extensive appendix contains a most valuable account of Scandinavian, German, and Dutch folk-poetry. A classified table of contents makes it possible for the student of any literary type to find his way with ease through this monumental and indispensable ground-plan of early Germanic literature.

Peacock, T. L. Four Ages of Poetry. In Ollier's Miscellany, 1820. Also in Peacock's Collected Works, vol. III, pp. 324–338, and in A. S. Cook's Shelley's Defense of Poetry.

Peck, H. T. The Lyrics of Tennyson.

See above, § 2.

Perry, E. D. Lyric Poetry. In Greek Literature: A Series of Lectures delivered at Columbia University. N.Y.: 1912.

A brief historical and appreciative essay on the Greek lyric.

Petit de Julleville, L. Histoire de la langue et de la littérature française des origines à 1900. 8 vols. Paris: 1896–1899.

The authoritative history of French literature. Arrangement according to types facilitates the use of the book.

Petsch, R. Neue Beiträge zur Kenntniss des Volksrätsels. In *Palaestra*, No. 4. 1899.

The folk lyric often takes the form of a riddle. For an introduction to the riddle see J. B. Friedreich, Geschichte des Räthsels (Dresden: 1861); E. Rolland, Devinettes ou énigmes populaires; on the Old English riddles, Camb. Hist. Eng. Lit., vol. I, Chap. IV and bibliography. The critical literature is fairly representative.

Piazza, S. L' Epigramma latino. Padova: 1898.

This is an extensive (308 pp.), clearly written history of the Latin epigram down to the time of Martial. Topics: Alexandrian epigram and epigrammatists; relation of these to early Latin epigrammatists; development of Latin epigram to Catullus; influence of Greek models; epigrams of Catullus in relation to their period. The author criticizes Lessing's definition of the epigram as too narrow to cover the field. On the Greek epigram see also above, § 2, Mackail.

PIÉRI, M. Le Pétrarquisme au XVI^e siècle, etc. Marseilles: 1895.

Discusses the influence of Petrarch in England and France, especially in reference to Ronsard. For other works dealing with English Petrarchism, see below, § 6, under the English lyric of the sixteenth century.

PLESSIS, F. Études critiques sur Properce et ses élégies.
See above, § 2.

POSNETT, H. M. Comparative Literature. N.Y.: 1896.
Pp. 39–41.

The lyric has changed with the change and development of language and of social and national conditions. "Each country has its own lyrical development expressing the changes of its social life." The lyric varies from the sacred or "magical" hymns of priest-bards to the written expressions of individual feeling. Posnett calls the earliest lyric the "communal"; the lyric of modern life is primarily characterized by the predominance of individualism. See Chap. II Early Choral Song; Chap. III Personal Clan Poetry; and below, § 11. For Posnett's method in general see Gayley and Scott, pp. 32, 260.

POTEZ, H. L'Élégie en France avant le romantisme (de Parny à Lamartine) 1778–1820. Diss. Paris: 1897.

A most convenient aid to the study of the French elegy. For further notice, see below, § 6, XXXIV, A, 6, (*d*).

QUADRIO, F. S. Della storia e della ragione d'ogni poesia. 7 vols. Bologna e Milano: 1739–1752.

The second volume (about 1200 pages, in two parts) is devoted to the origin and history of the lyric, the kinds of sacred lyric, musical and dance accompaniments, metrical forms and species (see particularly madrigal and epigram) of the lyric. The origin of the lyric is traced through Hebrew poetry, through David and Jubal and Henoch and Adam, to the hymns of the angelic hosts. Hundreds of names of lyric writers of all nations — Hebrew, Greek, Phoenician, Roman, Persian, Chinese, Provençal, Italian, French, German, English, etc. — are congregated uncritically; and to each name a brief and frequently untrustworthy note is added. The section upon metrical forms consists of a patient compilation of all the ancient divisions and subdivisions upon which Quadrio could lay his hands. There is no original criticism, — only a dictionary of names and species. But the work is a museum of forgotten titles, and is notable as an early essay at the historic-comparative method. Cf. above, § 2.

Quarterly Review, 192 (1900). English Patriotic Poetry.

Reed, E. B. English Lyrical Poetry from its Origins to the Present Time. New Haven: 1912.

The pioneer book in its field, this work contains much information, a mass of comment on particular authors and lyrics, and only the simplest of generalizations regarding the lyric character of the various ages of English literary history.

Rhys, E. Lyric Poetry. Lond.: 1913.

This volume "is not intended to be a history of lyric poetry so much as a tracing of the development of the lyric idea in English literature." Its method is appreciative, rather than scientific. Cf. Fuller, C. F. Johnson, F. E. Schelling, Stedman, Reed, above, § 2.

Ritson, J. A Select Collection of English Songs. 3 vols. Lond.: 1783.

In a prefatory Historical Essay on the Origin and Progress of National Song, Ritson distinguishes between the song and the narrative ballad (p. i, note); compare Ritson's Scottish Song (1774); Ancient Songs and Ballads (1790); etc.

ROHDE, E. Der griechische Roman und seine Vorläufer. 2d ed. Leipz.: 1900.

This standard and authoritative work is of considerable aid in tracing the development of the erotic elegy. See especially pp. 63–177.

ROTTER, C. Der Schnaderhüpfl-Rhythmus. In *Palaestra*, No. 90. 1912.

Rotter gives a list of the collections of this variety of folk poetry. See above under Grasberger.

SAINTSBURY, G. The Historical Character of the English Lyric.

See above, § 2.

SAINTSBURY, G. A Short History of French Literature. 6th ed. Oxford: 1901.

Pp. 51–60 Early Lyrics; 81–87 Later Songs and Poems. For special lyrists see Index. For the forms of Troubadour poetry see chapter on Provençal literature, pp. 22–29.

The Provençal literature, though chiefly lyrical in form, is not considered by Professor Saintsbury (or by Karl Bartsch, whom he follows) to have "exercised an initial influence over Northern French literature." That French lyrical poetry, however, has been affected by the spirit of Provençal verse, he does not deny.

SARRAZIN, J. V. Victor Hugo's Lyrik und ihr Entwickelungsgang. Ein krit. Versuch. Baden-Baden: 1885.

Worthy of comparison with Werner's study of Hebbel.

Sat. Rev. 57: 25 English Lyrics.

Sat. Rev. 62: 692 Lyrics from the Song-Books of the Elizabethan Age. (See A. H. Bullen's Lyrics from the Dramatists of the Elizabethan Age, and his More Lyrics from the Song-Books of the Elizabethan Age.)

SCHANZ, M. Geschichte der römischen Litteratur bis zum Gesetzgebungswerk des Kaisers Justinian. 4 vols. München:

1890–1904. Later eds. of various vols., 1898–1914. In I. von Müller's Handbuch der klassischen Altertums-Wissenschaft.

Indispensable to the student of the poetic types in Roman Literature.

SCHEDER, ——. Die Entwickelung der Lyrik in der klassischen Literatur-periode. In *Herrig's Archiv* 28: 165 (1860).

Dr. Scheder's article is a study of the connecting links between the lyrics of the pre-classical and the classical periods in Germany. Stating the principle of the lyric to be the "idea of mediation and reconciliation between the ideal and the real," Dr. Scheder attempts to prove that Barthold Heinrich Brockes (1680–1747) was the first German lyrist to discover this idea in the revelation of God in Nature. Brockes' *Irdisches Vergnügen in Gott* is consequently regarded as the forerunner of the nature poetry of Goethe, Schiller, Heine, Herder, and lesser poets.

SCHELLING, F. E. A Book of Elizabethan Lyrics. Boston: 1895.

The Introduction contains a brief historical account of the rise and development of the Elizabethan lyric of art, and a review "of the chief lyrical measures of the age from an organic as well as an historical point of view."

SCHELLING, F. E. A Book of Seventeenth Century Lyrics. Boston: 1899.

"In the Introduction an attempt has been made to trace the course of English lyrical poetry during the period (1625–1700), to explain its relations to the previous age, and to trace the influences which determined its development and its final change of character."

SCHELLING, F. E. English Literature during the Lifetime of Shakespeare. N.Y.: 1910.

Chaps. VIII, XI, XII, XIX.

On p. 121 Professor Schelling argues that the grasp of subtler phases of emotion and the mastery of form and of the music of speech, which are necessary to the lyric, make its development a matter of late literary growth. "Despite what must be admitted as to an impersonal lyrical quality inhering in much early popular poetry, an age, in which the gift of lyric expression is widely diffused, must be alike removed from the simplicity and immaturity which is content to note in its literature the direct effects of the phenomena of the outside world and no more, and from that complexity of conditions and that tendency to intellectualize emotion which characterize a time like our own."

The Elizabethan Age was ideally suited to lyrical expression.

SCHELLING, F. E. The English Lyric. Boston: 1913.

A very useful, unpretentious survey of the history of the English lyric: the best work of its scope. For general summary, see pp. 291–300.

SCHERER, W. History of German Literature. Trans. by Mrs. F. C. Conybeare. 2 vols. N.Y.: 1886.

In these volumes may be found frequent, valuable conclusions concerning the development of the German lyric. See, for instance, I: 5, 10–15, 18, 21 On the early lyric; I: 223, 259 Middle High German Poetry; I: 293, 370 Love Songs; I: 34 Christian Hymns; 277, 322, 359 Sacred Songs; I: 296, 315, 322, 369 Convivial Songs; I: 53, 248, 252 People's Songs. But especially interesting is the chapter in vol. II: 259–282 on lyric poetry from Jacobi and Klamer Schmidt to the present. This is the lyric poetry of Romanticism.

SCHERER, W. Poetik. Berlin: 1888.

Compare Gayley and Scott, p. 262; and note Burdach's point (p. 296 ff. of the Poetik) that lyric and drama are the earliest poetic phenomena.

SCHMIDT, E. Die Anfänge der Literatur und die Literatur der primitiven Völker. In Hinneberg's Kultur der Gegenwart (see above), T. I Abt. VII 1–27. Berlin and Leipz.: 1906.

The greater part of this convenient review of the earliest stages of poetic expression is concerned with such beginnings of the lyric as choral poetry and dance, prayers, riddles, cosmogonic songs, songs of the field, erotic and religious songs, charms, animal songs and dances, work and war songs, eulogistic and elegiac songs, and satirical verse. Compare below, § 6, XXXIII.

SCHULZE, K. P. Römische Elegiker. 3d ed. Berlin: 1890.

See the introduction for a brief review of classical elegy.

SCHURÉ, É. Histoire du Lied ou la Chanson Populaire en Allemagne. New ed. Paris: 1903. (1st ed. 1868.)

SCOTT, SIR W. Minstrelsy of the Scottish Border. 2 vols. Edinb.: 1873.

The prefatory Remarks on Popular Poetry afford an introduction to the Scottish branch of the subject. Compare the introduction to Motherwell's work, mentioned above.

SELLAR, W. Y.

See above, § 2.

Helpful in the study of Roman lyric poetry, especially the elegiac poets. The treatment, however, is more analytical than historical.

SMITH, A. Works. 5 vols. Lond.: 1811–12.

Vol. V, pp. 241–318 Of the Imitative Arts.

SMYTH, H. W. Greek Melic Poets. Lond.: 1900.

See the introduction for a brief account of the varieties of the Greek lyric. Pp. cxxxv–clii contain a very convenient Selected Bibliography of editions and monographs pertaining to the Greek lyric.

SPENCER, H.

See Gayley and Scott, Lit. Crit., Index.

STEDMAN, E. C. The Nature and Elements of Poetry. Boston: 1892.

See index under *Lyric* and *Subjectivity*.

SULZER, J. G. Allgemeine Theorie, etc.

See above, § 2.

SUSEMIHL, F. Die alexandrinische Litteratur. 2 vols. 1891–1892.

A standard work.

SYMONDS, J. A. Studies of the Greek Poets. 2 vols. N.Y.: 1880. Vol. I, pp. 26–31 Hesiod, the connecting link between the epic and lyric stages of Greek poetry; Chaps. X, XI The Lyric Poets, Pindar. Vol. II, Chap. XXII The Anthology.

Admirably stimulating and appreciative.

TALVJ (Fräulein T. A. L. von Jacob, afterwards Frau Robinson). Characteristik der Volkslieder germanischer Nationen. Leipz.: 1840.

Cf. Gayley and Scott, p. 273.

One of the first to discard the idea that lyric is subsequent to epic.

TEN BRINK, B. Early English Literature. Trans. by Kennedy-Robinson-Schmitz. 3 vols. N.Y.: 1889–1893.

Vol. I, pp. 14; 205–211.

A forcible statement of the reasons for regarding hymnic poetry as the original form of the lyric, and the precursor of the epic. Some seven arguments are given in support of ten Brink's assertion. The influence of French and Latin verse upon the evolution of English lyric poetry in the thirteenth century should be noted.

TEUFFEL, W. S. History of Roman Literature. 5th ed., trans. by G. C. W. Warr. Lond.: 1900.

See also the sixth German edition.

An authoritative work; to be consulted for the historical outlines of the various types in Roman literature.

THURAU, G. Der Refrain in der französischen Chanson. In *Litthist. Forschungen*, No. 23. 1901.

TIERSOT, J. Histoire de la chanson populaire en France. Paris: 1889.

For other works on the popular lyric see above, under Nisard.

TSCHERSIG, H. Das Gasel in der deutschen Dichtung und das Gasel bei Platen. In *Breslauer Beiträge zur Literaturgeschichte*, No. 11. 1907.

URBAN, E. Owenus und die deutschen Epigrammatiker des 18. Jhdts. In *Litthist. Forsch.*, No. 11. 1900.

A study of the literary influence of the English epigrammatist, John Owen (d. 1622).

VAGANAY, H. Le sonnet en Italie et en France au seizième siècle; essai de bibliographie comparée. (Bib. de faculté catholique de Lyon.) Lyon: 1902–1903.

VEITCH, J. The Feeling for Nature in Scottish Poetry. 2 vols. Edinb.: 1887.

This standard work covers the period 1300–1861, and is of considerable incidental aid to the student of the history of the Scottish lyric.

VEYRIÈRES, LOUIS DE. Monographie du Sonnet. Sonnettistes anciens et modernes. 2 vols. Paris: 1869.

"Ouvrage fondamental et qui témoigne de patientes recherches" (Vaganay).

VISCHER, F. J. Aesthetik.

See above, § 2.

VOSSLER, K. Das deutsche Madrigal, Geschichte seiner Entwickelung bis in die Mitte des XVIII. Jahrhunderts. In *Litterarhistorische Forschungen*, vol. VI. Weimar: 1898.

The history of the madrigal as a type is traced from Italy to Germany, and its modifications in the latter country (especially by Caspar Ziegler) up to the middle of the eighteenth century are set forth. Summary of conclusions, pp. 158–160. For other references on the madrigal, see under T. Oliphant, above.

WACKERNAGEL, W. Poetik, etc.

See above, § 2.

WALLASCHEK, R. Primitive Music. Lond.: 1893.

Chap. VI Text and Music; Chap. VII Dance and Music.

The author presents interesting evidence from savage life of the rise of song, the use of meaningless words, repetitions, and recitative, transition of song to speech, union of dance and song, etc.

WARREN, F. M. The Romance Lyric from the Standpoint of Antecedent Latin Documents. In *Pub. Mod. Lang. Ass.*, 26: 280. 1911.

Affords an introduction to the important problem of "the relation of Latin lyric poetry to the lyric poetry of the Romance peoples." Bibliography cited.

WATTS-DUNTON, W. T. Poetry. Sonnet.

See above, § 2.

WELTI, H. Geschichte des Sonettes in der deutschen Dichtung, mit einer Einleitung über Heimat, Entstehung und Wesen der Sonettform. Leipz.: 1884.

In the Appendix is printed A. W. Schlegel's Vorlesung über das Sonett. 1803.

Particularly valuable for the history of the German sonnet. The introductory material on the origin and development of the sonnet must be checked by later research.

WERNAER, R. M. The New Constructive Criticism. In *Pubs. Mod. Lang. Ass.*, 22: 421–445.

WERNER, R. M. Lyrik und Lyriker.

Cf. above, § 2; § 4, IV, A.

This monumental work contains much historical material.

Westm. Rev. New Series, vol. 42 (1872). Greek Lyrical Poetry.

The author considers the specializing tendency of Greek poetry (particularly of the lyric), which distinguishes it from Oriental verse. He emphasizes the "occasional" character of the Greek lyric and classifies it as religious and social (*de vita*). Perhaps the most valuable part of the paper is the discussion of the part played by poet-families in the cultivation of the lyric. In the same volume see an essay on Pindar.

Windscheid, K. Die englische Hirtendichtung von 1579 bis 1625. Halle: 1895.

Wodehouse, A. H. Article "Song," in Sir George Grove's Dictionary of Music and Musicians. Vol. III. Lond.: 1883.

Wolf, F. Über die Lais, Sequenzen und Leiche. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der rhythmischen Formen und Singweisen der Volkslieder und der volksmässigen Kirchen- und Kunstlieder im Mittelalter. Heidelberg: 1841.

An old, learned, and still valuable essay.

Wolff, E. Poetik. Die Gesetze der Poesie in ihrer geschichtlichen Entwicklung. Oldenburg und Leipz.: 1899.

In this important and seminal essay the author sketches the new conception and methods of historical poetics. The new poetics does not attempt to give rules to poetry, but by wide historical, comparative, and psychological induction to arrive at the principles of literary origins and development (variations). The development of the literary types is outlined according to the author's theory that the advance in poetry is from the objective and concrete to the subjective and abstract, and that the history of poetic inspiration involves an advance from original simplicity (simpleness?) to later, manifold variety and spiritual complexity. The student will find himself constantly hesitating to accept the broad generalizations of the historical section of the essay, — a hesitation that is an almost inevitable consequence of the extraordinary brevity with which vast topics are treated. He may also question Professor Wolff's conclusion that the lyric is of later origin than the epic.

ZINGERLE, A. R. Ovidius und sein Verhältnis zu den Vorgängern und gleichzeitigen römischen Dichtern. 3 Parts. Innsbruck: 1869–71.

Valuable for any student engaged in a detailed study of the Roman elegy.

SECTION 6. HISTORICAL STUDY BY NATIONALITIES: SPECIAL REFERENCES

As an aid to the historical study of the lyric the following outlines of the development of the type by various nationalities have been prepared. They do not aim to be exhaustive, but it is hoped that they may furnish such paraphernalia as may insure the student against serious omissions of critical material, open up to him some of the chief periods and problems of investigation, and afford an adequate starting point for original research in the history of the type.

In arranging these outlines a uniform method has been followed wherever the nature and extent of the materials have rendered it feasible. When possible a few works from which the student may gain the best general introduction to the history of the nation's lyrical literature are mentioned first. Then follows a brief indication of the main periods of development of the national lyric under consideration. Editions and translations come next, and after them a citation of some of the more important or representative works that deal with the history of the national lyrics, with particular poets or periods, or with particular problems of development. Where the lyric history of a nation is subdivided into centuries, the same general method is followed under each century. Where the body of material is small, as in the case of the less important nations or periods, it has not always been convenient to observe this ordering of divisions. In some cases, where the amount of material has justified it, the references on an individual poet have been kept together.

As already explained in the Preface to this work, repeated mention of the principal general histories of literature, bibliographical aids of a general nature, and learned periodicals has been avoided by listing such works in an Appendix. While using any part of the following outline the student should also consult the corresponding section of the Appendix. If, for instance, he happens to be making a study of the history of the Greek lyric, he should at once supplement the references under I The Greek Lyric with those under V–VII in the Appendix. Thus only will he be sure of finding some of the most important material on his subject.

I. The Greek Lyric.

The student will find the best general introductions to the study of the Greek lyric in the following works: H. Flach, Geschichte der griechischen Lyrik (Tübingen: 1884), the most exhaustive work on the subject; G. S. Farnell, Greek Lyric Poetry (Lond.: 1891), containing prefatory articles of an historical and analytical nature, the Greek text of the "readable fragments of the Greek Melic poets other than Pindar," with biographical and introductory matter on each of the lyric poets represented, together with certain additional notes of value; R. C. Jebb, The Growth and Influence of Classical Greek Poetry (Boston: 1893), Chaps. IV and V of which present an admirable, brief review of Greek lyric in general and of Pindar in particular; U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff in Die griechische u. lateinische Lit. u. Sprache (3d ed. Berlin u. Leipz.: 1912, pp. 29–53, 92–96, 209–218), being Thl. I, Abthl. VIII, of Hinneberg's Kultur der Gegenwart, — authoritative and recent; F. B. Jevons, A Hist. of Greek Lit. (N.Y.: 1904), excellent in its survey of the lyric, and of other types also; A. Biese, E. D. Perry, and H. W. Smyth, as noted above, § 5; E. Nageotte, Histoire de la poésie lyrique grecque (2 vols. Paris: 1888–89), well adapted to the needs of the student. Among the larger general histories of Greek literature the student should not fail to consult the works of Müller, Mure, Christ, Bernhardy, Bergk, and Croiset. A list of the more important guides in the general field of ancient classical poetry has been given by Gayley and Scott, pp. 369–370. See also Hegel, Symonds, *Westm. Rev.*, as in § 5, above. For works on Greek and Latin versification, see Gayley and Scott, § 24; for collections of the Greek lyric, see below. — On the influence of classical literature in later periods see Paul Shorey, Classical Lit. and Learning (Congress of Arts and Sciences, vol. III. St. Louis: 1906); H. O. Taylor, Classical Heritage of the Middle Ages (N.Y.: 1901); Sandys, A Hist. of Classical Scholarship; J. Churton Collins, Greek Influence on English Poetry (1910); F. G. Tucker, The Foreign Debt of English Literature (1907); also Schevill, Schröttner, Thayer, Chislett, and others noted below, II, References.

The history of the Greek lyric may be examined under eight heads. (1) Evidences of early popular lyrics (*Volkslieder*) prior to and coincident with the development of epic lays. This kind must have been of an objective nature, with large admixture of narrative matter. Along with it should be considered early religious lyric, with its later development in the so-called Homeric Hymns. (2) The beginnings of a new lyric development after the age of the Homeric epics. First of all should be noted the rise, 700–500 B.C., of political and reflective elegiac verse (Callinus, Tyrtaeus, Archilochus, Mimnermus, Solon, Theognis, Simonides of Ceos, etc.), and of personal lampoon in iambic measure (Archilochus, Simonides of Amorgos, Solon, Hipponax). For the elegy, see below, XXXIV, A. (3) Next should be noted the rise (660–540) of what the Greeks called melic, as distinguished from iambic and elegiac, poetry. This melic poetry developed two general kinds: the personal, Aeolic lyric at Lesbos (Sappho and Alcaeus), and the choral lyric under Dorian influences (Alcman, Arion, Stesichorus, Ibycus, etc.). Here the student will note the growth of subjectivity and reflection as the epic age recedes further and further into the past. The Doric lyric retained more of the objective character; the Aeolic was more deeply emotional in a personal way, but without the picturesque and vague vistas of the modern European lyric. What conditions of racial character and of environment may be regarded as contributing to these differences? Under what advances in culture did the elegiac, iambic, and melic developments take place? Can such changes in the cultural bases be shown to have been operative elsewhere than in Greece, — i. e., can it be shown that the development of the Greek lyric was in accordance with any general law governing the interrelation of social conditions and lyric expression? The student should carefully note the nature of the variations of literary form and content by which the epic passes into the lyric, or *vice versa*, and either or both into the drama. By collating and analyzing these variations some idea may be gained of characteristic steps in the mutation of literary species. (4) Next may be noticed the encouragement of the lyric by the Tyrants. To this period, 550–470, belong Ibycus and Anacreon. Simonides of Ceos and Bacchylides also wrote for Tyrants. The influence of the courtier's life upon the lyric is not so great in what remains to us of this poetry as might be expected. (5) The first half of the fifth century witnessed the flowering of Simonides, Pindar, and Bacchylides. Under the contagion of the social and political excitement of this period the Greek lyric attained its highest expression. Melic poetry, mainly Dorian in form, became national in spirit: hymns, paeans, choral dithyrambs, processional and dance songs, laudatory odes, and dirges appealed to all Greece. At the same time the condition of publication changed from that of the Tyrant's court to that in which the poet wrote to order for anyone who would buy his services at an agreed price. At first sight the new condition seems artificial, ill adapted to the spontaneity of the lyric; and the lyrists themselves complained of their lot, and longed for the 'older way.' Was, then, the great success of the lyric won in spite of these new circumstances; or were these circumstances, after all, stimulative even to lyric genius? The question involves the interesting and important problem of the relation of personal patronage to poetic development. The student would do well to follow the question through the lyric literatures of other nations. (6) With the advance of democracy the degeneration of the lyric set in. The condition of publication changed from patronage of the individual to award by public competition. The lyric author pandered to the taste of the crowd, and sensationalism of all sorts took the place of true poetic appeal. It is to this debased lyric that Plato refers in Laws, 700–701. The decline continued until melic poetry ceased to be a literary type of any importance, reverting to the conditions of occasional folk-composition that more or less persist in all periods, whatever the reigning fashions of literary production may be. (7) The Dorian dithyramb, however, or choral hymn to Dionysus, to which Arion (B.C. 600) had first given finished lyric form, had its further development, civic, ethical, and religious, in the tragedies of Aeschylus, Sophocles, and Euripides; and the old chorus of Satyrs was developed in the comedies of Aristophanes. This is the Attic and classical period (B.C. 500–385). In the choruses of the three masters of tragedy, in the lyric monodies also of the youngest, Euripides, the Greek lyric of this kind finds its profoundest, most imaginative, and most artistic expression; and in the parabases of Aristophanes an incomparable delicacy of fancy, wit, and graceful melody. To the still later history of the dithyramb under Philoxenus (d. 380) and of the citharode as practised by Timotheus (d. 357) an introduction is afforded by Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *op. cit.*, p. 92 ff. (8) Finally should be considered the later growth of the type: as in the Hymns of Callimachus (280–245) and the Alexandrian lyric, the lyric portions of the Idyls of Theocritus (280–260), the elegiac Laments of Bion and Moschus, and the Anthology (on the Anthology, see below, XXXIV, B, Epigram). The nature of this poetry varies very considerably, but much of it is written in the elegiac measure. See below, under XXXIV, A, Elegy, 3, and § 10, IX, C, Idyl; also Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *op. cit.*, p. 206 ff.

The student should note the succession of kinds in the Greek lyric. Beginning with a few varieties, the number increased to an amazing extent in the post-Homeric and classical periods. Every department of life had its special lyric form, so that, as has been observed, the Greek poet must usually have set out not to write like a modern poet on a subject that dictated its individual form, but to compose some one of the following general forms: hymn, partheneia, paean, nomos, comos, prosodion, dithyramb, hyporcheme (all addressed to the gods); epinicion, threnos, wedding-song (for men, under given circumstances); a tragic or comic chorus; a scolion on wine, or love, or politics; and many others. Should we regard this multiplicity of forms as responsible for the general character of the Greek lyric, for its occasional, objective, and formal traits? Or was the multiplicity of forms an effect, rather than the cause, of these traits? The student should consider also the relation of the lyric to Greek music. In the classical, Attic period, as well as at the time of Sappho, music played a subordinate part; but with the decline of the type the positions of music and words were reversed in importance (see Farnell, p. 34 ff., and references there cited). These facts may be made the basis of an extended, comparative investigation.

Editions and Translations. On ancient popular lyric see Benoist, Des chants populaires dans la Grèce antique (Nancy: 1857); Cerrato, I canti populari della Grecia antica (in *Rivista di Filol.*, 13: 193 ff., 289 ff. 1884–85); and other references listed below, or by H. W. Smyth, *op. cit.*, p. cxxxviii. For a critical edition of the Homeric hymns, with preface, notes, bibliography, etc., see T. W. Allen and E. E. Sikes, The Homeric Hymns (Lond.: 1904). — The standard critical edition of the lyric poets is that of T. Bergk, Poetae Lyrici Graeci (3 vols. Leipz.: 1866–67; 4th ed., 1878–82; vol. I, pt. 1, 5th ed. Leipz.: 1900). The same author's Anthologia Lyrica (text only) was published by Teubner (Leipz.: 1868; new ed., by Crusius, 1897). For a valuable review of the first work, see the *Westminster Rev.*, v. 42, N. S., noted above, § 5. Other editions by R. F. P. Brunck (1776), Gaisford (1823), and L. A. Michelangeli (Frammenti della melica greca, text, with trans. into Italian, introduction, etc. 5 Pts. Bologna: 1881–90), etc. There are German school editions by E. Buchholz (1898–1900), and F. Bucherer (1904); and the English school edition by H. W. Smyth (Greek Melic Poets. Lond.: 1890) is valuable for its introduction, notes, and an excellent bibliography to which the student should turn for further references. One of the most convenient of modern translations of the lyrics is the German translation of L. Straub, Liederdichtung und Spruchweisheit der alten Hellenen (Berlin: 1908). For translations of the Greek poets in general, see Gayley, Classic Myths in English Literature and in Art, p. 538 (Boston: revised ed., 1911).

The average student will find that the readiest and most satisfactory method of approach is afforded by the special editions and translations of the individual poets. See Alcaeus, Alcman, Anacreon, Bacchylides, Pindar, Sappho, Simonides, Callimachus, etc. H. W. Smyth (*op. cit.*) gives references for the melic poets and for several of the melic varieties.

Editions of the Greek Anthology (Palatina) are those by F. Jacobs (3 vols. Leipz.: 1813–17); Dübner, with trans. into Latin (3 vols. Paris: 1871–90); H. Stadtmueller (3 vols. Teubner, Leipz.: 1894–1906). — Partial translations of the Anthology are those of J. W. Mackail (see above, § 2); G. Burges, a selection for schools (Bohn, Lond.: 1852); G. R. Tomson (Canterbury Poets, Lond.: 1889); W. H. Appleton, Greek Poets in English Verse (Boston: 1893); W. R. Paton, Love Poetry of the Greek Anthology (Lond.: 1909). For further notice of the Anthology, see below, XXXIV, B, Epigram.

For modern popular lyric, see G. F. Abbott, Songs of Modern Greece (Cambridge: 1900; introductions and translations); Fauriel, Chants populaires de la Grèce moderne (2 vols. Paris: 1824; Eng. trans. by C. B. Sheridan. Lond.: 1825); L. M. J. Garnett and J. S. Stuart-Glennie, Greek Folk Poesy (2 vols. Lond.; 1896).

References. On the pre-Homeric lyric, see Flach as noted above; also Boeckh (*op. cit. supra*, § 5) p. 659, and the reference as given there to Westphal; cf. H. Köster, De cantilenis popularibus veterum Graecorum (Berlin: 1831). — Of works dealing with various subjects or poets the following may be mentioned: A. Baumstark, Der Pessimismus in der griechischen Lyrik (Heidelberg: 1898); A. Beltrami, Gl' inni di Callimacho e il nomo di Terpandro (1896); S. Bernagge, De Stesichoro lyrico (1880); Biese, Die Entwickelung des Naturgefühls bei den Griechen (Kiel: 1882–84); P. Brandt, Sappho (Leipz.: 1905); E. Cesati, Simonide di Ceo (1882); A. Croiset, La poésie de Pindare et les lois du lyrisme grec (Paris: 1880; cf. V. Giraud, in *Rev. d. D. Mondes*, April 15, 1881), — the first part of Croiset's work affords an admirable introduction to the theory of the Greek lyric; Deventer, Zu den griech. Lyrikern, Natur und Naturgefühl bei denselben (Gleiwitz: 1887); E. Ermatinger, Altgriechische Artistenlyrik. Ein Stück vgl. Literaturbetrachtung (in *Zeit*, 439. 1903); Percy Gardner, The Principles of Greek Art (N.Y.: 1914), Chap. XVII, on the relation of lyric and drama to painting; C. Giarratani, Tirteo e i suoi carmi (1905); J. Girard, Pindare, in Études sur la poésie grecque (Paris: 1900; p. 75 ff.); A. Hauvette, Les épigrammes de Callimaque, étude critique et littéraire (Paris: 1907); by the same author, Archiloque, sa vie et ses poésies (1905); R. C. Jebb, an edition of Bacchylides, with introduction, translation, notes, and bibliography (1905); R. C. Jebb, in Whibley's A Companion to Greek Studies (Cambridge: 1905; Chap. II, 1. Literature); P. Malusa, edition of Simonides of Amorgos, with introduction, etc. (1900); P. Masqueray, Théorie des formes lyriques de la tragédie grecque (Paris: 1895); B. J. Peltzer, De parodica Graecorum poesi (1855); A. Pischinger, Der Vogelgesang bei den griechischen Dichtern. . . . Ein Beitrag zur Würdigung des Naturgefühls der antiken Poesie (Progr. Eichstätt: 1901); A. Rubio y Lluch, Estudio crítico-bibliográfico sobre Anacreonte y su influencia en la literatura antiqua y moderna (Diss. Barcelona: 1879); W. Schröter, De Simonidis Cei melici sermone (1906); B. Steiner, Sappho (1907); J. A. Symonds, Greek Poets (see above, § 5); F. Thiersch, the Introd. to his trans. of Pindar (Leipz.: 1820); G. Vanzolini, Mimnermo (1883); M. Villemain, Essais sur le génie de Pindare, etc. (see above, § 2); H. T. Wharton, Sappho: memoir, text, selected renderings, literal translation, and bibliography (5th ed. Lond.: 1908); T. Zanghieri, Studi su Bacchilide (1905). The work by Flach, cited above, has much to say on the relation of music and lyric in Greek culture, and also upon foreign — chiefly oriental — influence on the Greek lyric. On the Alexandrian lyric, see the admirably arranged and most readable work of A. Couat, — La poésie alexandrine sous les premiers Ptolémées (Paris: 1882); A. Hauvette, Les épigrammes de Callimaque (Paris: 1907), a most convenient critical essay, accompanied by a translation; Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *op. cit.*, 209 ff.; further references will be found below, under XXXIV, A, Elegy, and in the Appendix.

II. The Roman Lyric.

An excellent guide to works on the various poets mentioned below will be found in the bibliographical sections of Martin Schanz, Geschichte der römischen Litteratur (in Iwan von Müller's Handbuch der klassischen Altertums-Wissenschaft. 3d ed. vol. VIII. München: 1907–11). The references are annotated, and the work is so accessible that it is unnecessary to reproduce its critical materials in this place. The history of the lyric may be gathered in outline from Friedrich Leo, Die römische Literatur (in Hinneberg, Thl. I, Abthl. VIII, 3d ed. 1912; cited above, § 5), and from other histories of Roman literature (Cruttwell, Teuffel, etc.) as noted in the Appendix.

The student will notice the indications of the existence of an early popular lyric, including dance songs, and of early religious hymns. He will then pass in review the fragments of choral and other lyric passages from the dramatists down to the time of Accius; the erotic elegies of Catullus, Tibullus, Propertius, and Ovid (see below, under XXXIV, A, Elegy); the Aeolic strain in Catullus; the odes of Horace; the Priapea of the Augustan Age; the rhetorical choruses of the Senecan tragedies; the epigrams of Martial (see below, under XXXIV, B, Epigram); the lyric and elegiac Silvae of Statius; the Pervigilium Veneris of the second or third century after Christ, with its signs of a new prosody and diction, and its romantic spirit; and the verse of Claudian (4th century after Christ), which may be said to bring to a close the distinctively Roman history of the lyric in Latin.

As a whole the Roman lyric is, of course, imitative of the Greek, especially the Alexandrian Greek. In accounting for the nature and development of this imitative literature the student will consider the influence upon lyric expression of a rich, luxurious "millionaire" class, the relation of lyric inspiration to the life of a cosmopolitan commercial center, such as Rome became, the further influences that sprang from the political conditions in Rome at successive periods, etc.

Much of the Roman lyric is in the elegiac measure, the rise and development of which is considered separately (see below, XXXIV, A, Elegy).

Too great emphasis cannot be laid upon the influence of Ovid and Horace on the learned lyrics (chiefly Latin, but through them on the vernacular) of the Dark and Middle Ages, since this influence is the chief link between ancient and modern lyric poetry.

Editions and Translations. In tracing the development of the lyric of Rome, Weber's Corpus Poetarum, John Wordsworth's Fragments and Specimens of Early Latin (Lond.: 1874), The Oxford Book of Latin Verse (ed. H. W. Garrod, Clarendon Press), and North Pinder's Selections from the less-known Latin Poets (Oxford: 1869) will prove helpful. The student will consult also the Anthologia Latina of Bücheler and Riese (2 vols. Teubner, Leipz.: 1870–97) and Baehrens' Poetae Latini Minores (6 vols. Teubner, Leipz.; 1879–86; ed. F. Vollmer. 1910 ff.). The fragments are collected in Baehrens' Fragmenta Poetarum

Romanorum (Teubner, Leipz.: 1886). Special editions of Catullus, Tibullus, Horace, Ovid, etc. need not be mentioned here; see the bibliographic references in Schanz. For translations see Gayley, Classic Myths (revised ed., 1911) p. 539, and below under XXXIV, A, 4, Roman Elegy.

References. For Ovid's influence on medieval literature see R. Schevill's Ovid and the Renascence in Spain (*Univ. of California Pubs. in Mod. Philol.*, vol. IV, No. 1, 1913) and the further bibliography cited in the notes to the first 26 pages of that article, including W. Schröttner's Ovid und die Troubadours (Diss. Marburg: 1908). For Horace's influence, see E. Stemplinger, Das Fortleben der horazischen Lyrik (in *Zeitschr. f. vergl. Littgesch.*, 16: 97 ff.), W. Y. Sellar, Horace and the Elegiac Poets (2d ed., by A. Lang, Clarendon Press), M. R. Thayer, Influence of Horace on the Chief English Poets of the 19th Cent. (*Cornell Studies in English*, No. 2. Yale Univ. Press: 1916), and W. Chislett, Jr., Classical Influence in Eng. Lit. in the 19th Cent. (Boston: 1918). For Catullus, R. Ellis, Commentary (Oxford, 1876); H. Patin, Du renouvellement de la poésie latine par Lucrèce et par Catulle, in Études sur la poésie latine (2 vols. 3d ed. Paris: 1883); U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, Catull, Reden u. Vorträge (1901), p. 214 ff. See also Sellar's Roman Poets of the Republic; and for the succeeding period H. E. Butler's Post-Augustan Poetry (Clarendon Press). The Roman lyric of the Dark Ages may be traced in the 3d vol. of Teuffel's Römische Literatur (6th ed. Leipz.-Berlin: 1913; Eng. trans. from 5th ed. by G. C. W. Warr, Lond.: 1892, vol. II), and Manitius, Gesch. der lat. Lit. des Mittelalters, Thl. 1 (München: 1911).

III. The Byzantine Lyric.

On the Byzantine Lyric, see K. Krumbacher, Geschichte der Byzantinischen Litteratur von Justinian bis zum Ende des oströmischen Reiches, 527–1453 (2d ed. München: 1897. In I. von Müller's Handbuch der klassischen Altertums-Wissenschaft. Bd. IX, Abthl. 1), pp. 643–4, 648–52, 653–705, 706–46 (Greek Anthology, 725–30), 749–86, 787–823. Full bibliographies accompany the various divisions.

IV. Christian Greek and Latin Hymns of the Dark and Middle Ages.

No better reference can be given the student beginning the investigation of Christian hymnic poetry than Lord Selborne's article on Hymns, in the Encyc. Brit. It is historical, critical, and bibliographical, and will acquaint the reader with the outlines and possibilities of the subject. Consult also for a general view Ebert, Gröber, and Manitius, as noted above, § 5; A. Baumgartner, Gesch. der Weltliteratur, vol. IV; H. O. Taylor, Classical Heritage of the Middle Ages, pp. 247–301, and, for important bibliography, p. 375 ff.

The importance of the Christian hymn — particularly the Latin Christian hymn — in the Dark and Middle Ages is so decided, its position is so commanding, its influence in breaking up old literary traditions and supplying a plastic, popular form to express the new life of modern Christian Europe is so primary, that it deserves here a section to itself.

> The hymns went further and affected a larger number of people's minds than anything else in literature [during the Dark and Middle Ages]. They gave the impulse to fresh experiment which was so much needed by scholarly persons; provided new rules and a new ideal of expression for the unscholarly. Those who had no mind to sit down and compose an epithalamium in hexameters or a birthday epistle in elegiacs, might still write poetry in Latin, — unclassical Latin, indeed, but not dull, not ungentle — a language capable of melody in verse and impressiveness in diction. . . . Also the free Latin verse [of the hymns] is the origin of all the rhythms and measures of modern poetry in the Romance languages, and in English and German too, where they are content, as Shakespeare and Milton generally were, with the Romance types of versification (Ker, Dark Ages, pp. 199–200).

On the development of a new versification see the next division below, v.

The interested student will strive to form a clear conception of the development of the hymn from the psalms and "spiritual songs" of the early Christians as mentioned in the New Testament (Taylor, Class. Her. of M. A., p. 249), through the Arian songs of the East and the great Greek hymn-writers, to its development in the Latin West and its final flowering, as a Latin form, in the great hymns of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries (Stabat Mater, Dies Irae, etc.). He should consider, among hymnists of the Eastern Church (in Greek), Hierotheus, Ephraem Syrus, Synesius, Methodius, Gregory Nazianzen, Anatolius, Romanus, Sophronius, and St. John Damascene; among those of the Western Church (in Latin), St. Hilary of Poitiers, St. Ambrose, Prudentius (the Christian follower of Horace, "who bridged the gulf between Pagan poetry and Christian Hymnody"), Sedulius, Gregory the Great, and Venantius Fortunatus; in the early medieval period, Bede; in the later medieval, Notker, St. Bernard of Clairvaux, Adam of St. Victor, Jacopone da Todi, Tomasso de Celano, Jacobus de Benedictis, St. Thomas Aquinas, Bernard of Morlaix, etc.

The scholarship that has concerned itself with these hymns has been devoted primarily to their collection and to the establishment of their authorship and historical sequence. Students of comparative literature have given them little attention beyond noting the progressive breaking down of quantitative in favor of accentual verse, the intrusion of rhyme, and the development of the sequence-stanza (see below, V, C).

A few topics of significance in connection with the nature and growth of the lyric may be suggested: In what respects is the difference between the nature of pagan and Christian hymns a difference in the essential character of their religious inspiration? Does the early Christian hymn derive in form, purpose, and nature from Greek, Roman, and Hebrew lyrics (psalms) indiscriminately, or is its form due to one source, its spirit and purpose to another, etc. (cf. Ebert, 1: 172–184)? What evidences are there to show that the development of hymns falls under laws other than those governing the growth of secular lyrics? What are the differences between secular and sacred lyrics in regard to psychology of inspiration, means of publication, character of audience, and methods of preservation? and how do such differences affect the development of the two kinds? Is the later Christian hymn analogous in any of these respects to popular poetry? Was Luther's use of popular lyric tunes for a German evangelical hymnody an illustration of this analogy? and are there not many other illustrations of the same kind? Can any relations of nature and development be established between the hymn and the patriotic lyric? In a word, is the hymn a form to be studied in its relation to the crowd rather than to the individual? and is a modern religious hymn the nearest modern approach to the communal lyric?

Editions, Translations, References. (1) For texts of the *Greek hymns*, as well as for critical and historical materials, see W. Christ und M. Paranikas, Anthologia Graeca Carminum Christianorum (Leipz.: 1871); Cardinal Pitra's Hymnographie de l'église grecque (Rome: 1867), and Analecta Sacra (Paris: 1876); H. A. Daniel, Thesaurus Hymnologicus (5 vols. Leipz.: 1855–56); A. J. Rambach, Anthologie christlicher Gesänge, etc. (6 vols. Altona and Leipz.: 1817–33); J. Kayser, Beiträge zur Geschichte und Erklärung der ältesten Kirchenhymnen (2 vols. 2d ed. Paderborn: 1881–86); see also K. Krumbacher, Die griechische Literatur des Mittelalters, in Die Kultur der Gegenwart (1904) I, 8.259 ff., and von Wilamowitz in the same volume, p. 213 ff. (2) In the study of *Latin hymnic poetry* reference should be made to Kayser, Daniel, and Rambach, as just noted, and to the following: G. M. Dreves and others, Analecta Hymnica Medii Aevi (53 vols. Leipz.: 1886–1911); F. J. Mone, Lateinische Hymnen des Mittelalters (3 vols. Freib.: 1853–55); vol. I of Wackernagel's Das deutsche Kirchenlied, etc. (Leipz.: 1864); R. C. Trench, Sacred Latin Poetry, Chiefly Lyrical (2d ed. Lond.: 1864), — unexcelled as an introduction and collection; J. M. Neale, Medieval Hymns and Sequences (Lond.: 1867); Mrs. Charles, The Voice of Christian Life in Song (N. Y.: 1867); P. Schaff, Christ in Song (N. Y.: 1868); G. A. Königsfeld, Lateinische Hymnen und Gesänge, etc. (2 vols. Bonn: 1847–65); G. C. F. Mohnike, Hymnologische Forschungen (Stralsund: 1831); Abbé Ulysse Chevalier, Repertorium Hymnologicum, vol. I (Paris: 1892); F. W. E. Roth, Lateinische Hymnen des Mittelalters, etc. (Augsburg: 1887); S. V. Cole, The Development of Form in the Latin Hymns (in *Andover Rev.*, 10: 343); F. A. March, Latin Hymns (N. Y.: 1896), and W. A. Merrill, Latin Hymns (Boston: 1904) — which, combined, illustrate the mutations down to the present, and are convenient annotated editions for school and college use. J. Julian's Dictionary of Hymnology (1892; rev. ed. 1907) treats of hymns of all ages and nations, and contains essays on various related subjects. For the older authorities on Latin hymnody, such as Walafridus Strabo, Radulphus, Clichteveus, George Cassander, etc., as well as for the older authorities on Greek hymnody, see Lord Selborne's article.

The most available collection of Greek and Latin hymns for English readers is J. Brownlie's Hymns of the Early Church translated from

Greek and Latin sources; together with translations from a later period, centos and suggestions from the Greek, and several original pieces (Clarendon Press, Oxford). See also the translations in Hymns Ancient and Modern, and in The Church Hymnal, Boston, 1894 (Alphabetical Index of First Lines for provenience). A small but convenient anthology of Greek, Latin, German, Italian, French, Danish, and Welsh hymns in English translations is that of R. M. Moorsom (A Historical Companion to Hymns Ancient and Modern. 2d ed. Lond.: 1903). For modern hymns, see below, under the divisions devoted to English and German lyrics.

V. Other Latin Christian Lyric Poetry from the Second to the Fourteenth Century.

For general views of the literature of this section see Ebert, Manitius, Schanz, Gröber, Paul, and Ker, as noted above, § 5; also the appropriate sections in Hinneberg's Die Kultur der Gegenwart. Further references and the general literary character of each of the sub-periods noted in this division are given below, § 12, IV. For an arrangement in their chronological order of documents from the first to the eleventh century that allude to non-literary poetry, Latin or Romance, see F. M. Warren in *Pub. Mod. Lang. Ass.*, vol. 26 (1911). Taylor's Class. Heritage of the M.A. contains helpful criticism and bibliography.

Throughout the Latin poetry of the Dark and Middle Ages several important facts affecting the continuity of pagan Latin, Christian Latin, and medieval vernacular poetry must be noted. (1) The Christian Latin poets followed, in a general way, the forms or kinds of ancient poetry: heroic narrative in hexameters, philosophic-didactic poems in hexameters, many varieties of occasional poems in elegiac distichs (including panegyrics, epithalamia, memorial verses, epistles, etc.; see, for example, the epithalamia mentioned by Ebert, 1: 306, 422, 434, 525, *et passim*), and other lyric forms in iambics, trochaics, sapphics, etc. But the application of these forms in a new spirit to new subjects produced certain remarkable variations that were conserved as new types, such as the lyrical-narrative, the Biblical paraphrase, the Christian hymn, and the Carmina Burana (songs of wandering students). (2) Christian Latin poetry made use of ideas, phrases, and ornaments drawn from classic, pagan poetry, especially from Virgil and Horace. The extent of this practice was great and noteworthy; its investigation promises valuable results. (3) The gradual prosodical changes in Christian Latin poetry by which it passed from the regulating principle of quantity to that of accent are particularly significant as bearing upon the development of a vernacular art lyric of accentual measures, — in other words, upon modern verse. These changes are associated most of all with the hymn; but other forms as well, both epic and lyric, exemplify the general movement. The first Christian poets naturally made use of the classical metres; and the irregular use of these metres did much toward preparing the way for a new prosody. But a tendency to keep to the word-accent within the classical metres is soon noticeable. It is possible that this change was in reality "a return to the natural genius of the language," for it is certain "that the old Latin (Saturnian) rhythms, before the Greek forms were introduced, had more likeness to modern verse in their accent than Greek verse has" (Ker, Dark Ages, p. 201; cf. Stengel, Romanische Verslehre, in Gröber, II, i; W. M. Lindsay, The Accentual Element in Early Latin Verse, in *Trans. Philol. Soc.*, March 2, 1894). Rhyme also was developed; after the fifth century it becomes especially noticeable. Slowly the accent and rhyme made over some of the old metrical patterns. To be sure the hexameter, elegiac distich, and the sapphic "did not lend themselves readily to the change from quantity to accent. Though continuing in rude use in mediaeval Latin poetry, they did not become a medium for the evolution of accentual verse forms." But other patterns had more affinity with the new tendencies. "The simple iambic and trochaic metres readily passed through the change and emerged from it to new life as accentual verse, with the added element of rhyme. From this accentual and rhymed verse novel verse-forms were developed with more impressive rhymes" (Taylor, Class. Heritage of M. A., p. 285). But classical metres continued to be written along with rhythmic (accentual) verse; the Carolingian renaissance witnessed a revival of these metres, even while accentual verse and rhyme were developing rapidly. The question of the relation of Latin accentual poetry and vernacular accentual verse resolves itself into speculation concerning the probable interaction or reciprocal influence of the two strains. Insufficiency of data renders decision difficult. For references on the transition from quantity to accent, see Gayley and Scott, §§ 22–24, especially pp. 492–494, and Taylor, Class. Heritage of M. A., p. 375 ff.; for a succinct account, serving as an introduction to the subject, see Ker, Dark Ages, pp. 199–218. (4) Finally, the general effect of Latin poetry upon literary composition in the European languages should be investigated. Professor Saintsbury writes:

> It [this Latin poetry] was indirectly as well as directly, unconsciously as well as consciously, a schoolmaster to bring the vernacular languages to literary accomplishment. They could not have helped imitating it, if they would; and they did not think of avoiding imitation of it, if they could. It modified, to a very large extent, their grammar; it influenced, to an extent almost impossible to overestimate, the prosody of their finished literature; it supplied their vocabulary; it furnished models for all their first conscious literary efforts of the more deliberate kind, and it conditioned those which were more or less spontaneous (Flour. of Romance, p. 2; cf. Ebert, 1 : xi).

A. *To the Time of Charlemagne.* The lyric poetry of this period is less extensive than the epic. The hymns of St. Ambrose (c. 340–397) are, for us at any rate, the first Christian Latin lyrics in the West, for though Hilary of Poitiers (c. 300–367) is reputed the first writer of Latin hymns, the tradition is uncertain and there are in existence no hymns that are indisputably his. We may point out, by the way, that the material of these first lyrics was in itself somewhat original as contrasted with the metrical paraphrases of the Bible that constitute the beginnings of the Christian epic (cf. below, § 12, IV, B). For lyric verse of a sort other than the sacred hymn we turn first to the epigrammatic or lyrical-narrative panegyrics addressed to various martyrs by Damasus (Pope from 366 to 384) and Prudentius (348–c. 410). The Peristephanon (De Coronis) of the latter is especially noteworthy as the definite forerunner of much lyrical narrative in the Middle Ages and even more modern times. The student should observe that the church hymns and the Peristephanon are alike in that they both are pervaded by a spirit of praise, though the subjects of praise are different. Is the lyrical-narrative panegyric to be regarded as a new species that arose as a variation from the hymn, by change in subject-matter? Or is it to be traced to Roman panegyrical verse? Another lyric form is represented by the three prayers of Ausonius (c. 310–395) mentioned by Manitius (Gesch. christ.-lat. Poesie, pp. 107–110). A special study of the rise of lyric Christian prayer, and its relation to hymn and panegyric, would prove both valuable and interesting. But the best conception of the nature of non-hymnal lyric poetry in the fourth and fifth centuries may be gained from the works of Paulinus of Nola (353–431). Lyrical-narrative poems, prayers and panegyrics, an epithalamium, and various occasional verses make up the lyrical part of Paulinus' work. In the fifth century, and especially the first two decades of the sixth, panegyrical verse, occasional in character, addressed to Caesars and consuls or dedicated to marriages and jubilees, was much in vogue (e.g., the works of Flavius Merobaudes, Apollinaris Sidonius, and the African poets mentioned by Ebert 1: 429–432). The derivation of these poems from Roman models (see the poems of Claudian, second half of the fourth century) and their influence upon similar verse in the Middle Ages should be investigated. In the sixth century lived Venantius Fortunatus, one of the chief Latin poets from 550 to the time of Charlemagne. Among his many poetic remains are panegyrics, epitaphs, elegies, epigrams, and hymns. See also the occasional lyrics of Eugenius II (Ebert 1: 603). Finally, the ever popular Riddle and Acrostic offer other fields for research (cf. Ebert 1: 650; Manitius, Gesch. d. lat. Lit. des Mittelalters, 187–207). The seventh century was one of singular poetic decline; for further notice of the period from Justinian to Charlemagne, see Manitius, Gesch. d. lat. Lit. des M., 153–207.

Texts and Monographs. Bibliography may be found in Manitius, Ebert, Gröber, and Taylor. Ampère's Hist. litt. de la France avant Charlemagne (2 vols., 1870) may be added to the general references on the period. An interesting, popular account of early Christian poetry, which stimulates disagreement and speculation, is contained in two articles published by Gaston Boissier in the July and September numbers of the *Rev. d. Deux Mondes* for 1875.

B. *The Carolingian Renaissance.* The general character of the poetic literature of this period is indicated below, § 12, IV, D. The secular tendency of the literature, as there noted, is illustrated by the prevailingly occasional character of the lyric. The lyrics of Alcuin and Paulus Diaconus (see Ebert 2: 27–32, 51–56) illustrate the court lyric, which owed its life to the training in the arts and sciences encouraged by Charlemagne. These lyrics are primarily secular, occasional, and didactic. Elegiacs and sapphics are the favorite measures. Lyrics of wit, epitaphs, and epigrams — the usual lyric by-play — are also to be found. Alcuin's poem to a nightingale and Paulus' elegy on Lake Comus will attract the student of nature-poetry. The rhythmic (non-quantitative) hymn-measure is also used by Paulus (see Ebert 2: 58; cf. 55–56). Some lyrical episodes may be found in the epistles of Theodulf, who occupies perhaps the chief place among the poets of the age (see, e.g., the opening of the long epistle to Charlemagne). He is the author of the last part of the hymn for Palm Sunday, — the Gloria Laus. For other lyrics of his see Ebert 2: 84.

Texts and Monographs. Ebert 2: 12, 27–32, 36, 51–56, 70, 79–84; also in Manitius, Gröber, and Taylor. For texts see bibliography in the histories just indicated. Among general collections we may mention particularly Dümmler and Traube's Poetae Latini Aevi Carolini (3 vols. In Monumenta Germaniae Historica). On Theodulf see C. Cuissard, Théodulphe évêque d'Orléans, sa vie et ses œuvres (Orléans: 1892); article by M. Manitius in *Neues Archiv der Gesell. für alt-deutsche Gesch.* (1886); on Paulus Diaconus, Ed., K. Neff, Die Gedichte des Paulus Diaconus (München: 1908); F. Dahn, Langobardische Studien, Bd. I (Leipz.: 1876). On the variety of classical metres from the age of Charlemagne to Charles the Bald, see below, under XXXIV, A, 5, (*b*).

C. *The Decline of the Carolingian Renaissance*, from the death of Charlemagne to the accession of Otto the Great (814–936). — The Latin lyric is here of little aesthetic importance. As under Charlemagne, it is primarily occasional in character, dealing with both sacred and secular subjects. The versifications of Urbanus are reminiscent of those of Alcuin. Walafrid Strabo's lyrics, epigrams, and eclogues show a true poetic gift. Gottschalk's poems are noticeable for the employment of rhyme and accentual rhythm (Ed., L. Traube, in Monum. Germ. Hist. Poet. Lat., III, 707–738). For the paraphrases of the Psalms by Florus of Lyons, and the important lyrics of Godescalc, see Manitius, G. l. L. M., 566, 568–572. Some poetic power is evinced by Sedulius Scotus (elegiac, panegyric, epistolary verse), and the Spaniard Alvarus did some little things, mostly mere exercises. The chief interest of the study of these lyrics and others of the same period lies in the development of popular accentual measures and of rhyme (see Ebert, 2 : 311–328).

During the second half of this period one development of some importance occurred. This was the invention of rhythmic prose passages to fit the musical 'Sequences' which in the Church services intervened between the Graduale and the Gospel. "The tunes were found hard to remember, and experiments were made in fitting words to them, possibly by Alcuin among others" (Ker, Dark Ages, p. 219). It was during this period, at any rate, that the composing of lyrical prose sequences became a common exercise. Notker Balbulus of St. Gall's Monastery, who also wrote hymns and occasional lyrics, was especially good at the new device, and his success was a stimulus to others. Much of the manner, and especially the parallelism of these compositions, were learned from the Psalms of David, with which they should be compared. The relation of these sequences to the *Leich* of Middle High German poetry and the old French *Motet* offers a field for research. Other religious and occasional lyrical compositions, including tropes, litanies, antiphons, and hymns, are mentioned by Ebert, 3 : 153–175. See also Manitius, G. l. L. M., 594–598, 605–607.

Texts and Monographs. See Ebert, Manitius, and Gröber. On the Sequences, see F. Wolf, Über die Lais, Sequenzen und Leiche (Heidelberg: 1841); K. Bartsch, Lateinische Sequenzen des Mittelalters (1868); Ker, Dark Ages, pp. 218–221; Ebert, 2: 144 ff.

D. *From the age of Otto the Great (936) to the Eleventh Century.* The occasional lyric and the epigram still hold their ground. The composition of sequences and hymns also goes forward. It is interesting to notice that secular lyrics and *Schwanken* take on the manner of the sequences (Ebert 3: 343–348). For drinking songs, see Ebert 3: 353. For Ekkehard's lyrics, see Manitius, G. l. L. M., 610–611. On p. 635 of his work Manitius refers to two Latin lyrics from Italy that belong to this period.

E. *Eleventh to the Fourteenth Century.*

For references on this difficult period, see below, § 12, IV, G.

The literature of this period is primarily a prose literature,— the prose of the Schoolmen. Of lyric poetry there are the Latin hymns and metrical sequences of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries (many of our finest hymns, such as the Dies Irae and Stabat Mater, are from this period; see above, IV), and the comic Carmina Burana or Goliardic poems. Though other forms of Latin poetry are now on the wane, these are full of vitality; and meanwhile new lyric and narrative life is flowering in the European vernacular tongues. The Goliardic poems (12th and 13th centuries) consist of lively and popular, satirical, erotic, and convivial verse, mostly in the form of songs. They were composed by "wandering students of all nations who traversed Germany, France, Italy, Spain, England, seeking special knowledge at the great centers of learning, following love-adventures, poor and careless, coldly greeted by the feudal nobility and clergy, attached to the people by their habits but separated from them by their science." Symonds, whom we have just quoted, suggests that the frank carnalism and moral laxity of these songs, their satire of the Church but conformity to its doctrines, "reveal the smoldering embers of unextinguished paganism, which underlay the Christian culture of the middle ages." Whether they are to be viewed thus, or as a reaction against the asceticism and hypocrisy of the Church, or merely as "indicative of the wide diversity of temperament" that exists in every age, their relation to the Renaissance, with whose spirit they are in striking affinity, affords a fascinating subject of speculation. They at least are the unfettered expression of a tendency in human nature that, whatever may have been its status in the learned and religious world of the Middle Ages, received its due share of artistic emphasis in the Renaissance, especially the Italian Renaissance. Examples of these poems are at hand in the collection from the Bavarian Monastery at Benedictbeuren (ed. Schmeller, as below) and in the poems of "Bishop Golias" attributed to Walter Mapes.

Texts, Translations, References. For the *hymns*, see above, IV; for examples of the metrical sequences see D. S. Wrangham, The Liturgical Poetry of Adam of St. Victor (3 vols. Lond.: 1881), which contains an introduction, the Latin originals, and English translations. — For the *Goliardic poems* (Carmina Burana, Carmina Vagorum), see J. A. Schmeller, Carmina Burana (Stuttgart: 1847; 3d ed. Breslau: 1894); T. Wright, The Latin Poems commonly attributed to Walter Mapes (Camden Soc., Lond.: 1841); F. Novati, Carmina Medii Aevi (Firenze: 1883); M. G. Gröber, Carmina Clericorum, etc. (7th ed. Heilbrunn: 1890); A. Bömer, Eine Vagantenliedersammlung (in *Zeitschr. f. deut. Alt. und Lit.* 49: 161. 1907–08); for selections see Bärnstein's Carmina Burana Selecta (Würzburg: 1879; with bibliog.) and the Teubner Gaudeamus! Carmina Vagorum Selecta (Leipz.: 1877); and for English translations of a few see the charming little volume, Wine, Women and Song (1884) of J. A. Symonds. O. Hubatsch, Die lateinischen Vagantenlieder des Mittelalters (Görlitz: 1870), contends for a French origin of these songs. See, also, Spiegel, Die Vaganten und ihr "Orden" (Spires: 1892); M. B. Ogle (in *Mod. Lang. Notes*, Dec. 1912); M. Haessner, Goliardendichtung und die Satire im 13ten Jahrh. in England (Leipz.: 1905); Langlois, La litt. goliardique (in *Revue Bleue*, Dec. 24, 1892, and Feb. 11, 1893); the article in La Grande Encyclopédie; B. Lundius, Deutsche Vagantenlieder in den Carmina Burana (in *Zeitschr. f. deut. Phil.* 39: 330. 1907); J. A. Symonds, Introd. to the translations noted above, and Italian Lit. (Renaiss. in Italy), vol. I, pp. 9, 108, 156, 327 (N.Y.: 1882). Most of these contain further bibliography. — Other works bearing upon this period are:

Robinson Ellis, Catullus in the 14th Century (Clarendon Press, Oxford); L. Grilli, Versioni poetiche dai lerici latini dei secoli XV e XVI (Città di Castello: 1898), — Italian versions of poems by Poliziano, Sannazaro, Bembo, etc., with an introduction; Grimm and Schmeller, Lateinische Gedichte des 10. and 11. Jhdts. (1838; ed. Althof, 1899), containing the Ruodlieb (cf. below, XIII, B); Anselm's Mariale, poems in honor of the Virgin, edited by P. Ragey (Tournai: 1885); Ronca, Metrica e ritmica latina nel medio evo (Roma: 1890), and Cultura medioevale e poesia latina d' Italia nei sec. XI e XII (Roma: 1892).

F. *Popular Latin Poetry of the Middle Ages.* In addition to the materials already cited under Hymns (IV, above) and the Goliardic poems of which we have just spoken, see E. du Méril, Poésies populaires latines antérieures au douzième siècle (Paris: 1843), containing introduction, text, and notes; and, by the same, Poésies populaires latines du Moyen Age (Paris: 1847), and Poésies inédites du Moyen Age (Paris: 1854); also, A. C. Clark, The Cursus in Mediaeval and Vulgar Latin (Clarendon Press). For earlier (first century to eleventh) references to popular poetry see the summary by F. M. Warren in *Pub. Mod. Lang. Ass.*, vol. 26 (1911).

VI. **On Latin Poetry of the 15th and 16th Centuries,** see Baumgartner, as noted above, IV; A. Schroeter, Beiträge zur Geschichte der neulateinischen Poesie Deutschlands und Hollands (*Palaestra* 77, Berlin: 1909), — especially rich in accounts of elegiac verse, discussing the poetical works of Conrad Celtes, Petrus Lotichius, Georg Sabinus, Johannes Stigelius, Johannes Secundus, Hugo Grotius, Johannes Posthius, and Caspar von Barth; G. Manacorda, Geiger, and G. Ellinger, as noted below, XIII, D; and vols. VII, X, XIV of the Lateinische Litteraturdenkmäler des XV. and XVI. Jahrhunderts. Of the last reference, vol. VII contains an edition, by G. Ellinger, of certain German-Latin poets of the sixteenth century; vol. X, the De Poetis Nostrorum Temporum (1551) of Lilius Gregorius Gyraldus, ed. by K. Wotke; vol. XIV, an edition, by G. Ellinger, of the Basia (1531) of J. Nicolai Secundus, the introduction to which traces the history of this little lyric kind — the Basia — from the

Greek Anthology, through the Latin erotic poets, to European imitations. An English translation of the Basia of Secundus was published by George Ogle, in 1731; it has been edited by W. Rice (Chicago: 1901). A very convenient collection of Italian Latin lyrics is E. Costa's Antologia della lirica latina in Italia nei secoli XV e XVI (Città di Castello: 1888). It contains an introduction and selections from a great variety of poets. The principal lyric kinds represented are elegy, epigram, hymn, carmen. For Ariosto's Latin verse see Carducci, Poesie latine edite ed inedite di L. Ariosto (Bologna: 1875). Poliziano's Latin poetry has been edited by Isidoro Del Lungo (Firenze: 1867). On this same period see Leonardo Bruni, Dialogus de Tribus Vatibus Florentinis (Dante, Petrarch, Boccaccio) in Bruni's works (ed. by Wotke, Wien: 1889); Arsilli, De Poetis Urbanis (cf. Tiraboschi, Lett. Ital. VII, 3, 403 ff. Napoli: 1781); Giovio, Elogia virorum litteris inlustria, in Opera, vol. VII (Basel: 1577).

VII. **The French (including the Provençal) Lyric.**

Aside from the general histories of French literature we know of no comprehensive introduction to the history of the French lyric. Excellent monographs on particular periods and movements exist in considerable number; they are mentioned below in connection with different periods. General mention may be made here of two series of short critical monographs: Les grands écrivains français, and the Classiques populaires. Of the histories, that edited by Petit de Julleville and the Gesch. der franz. Litt. of H. Suchier and A. Birch-Hirschfeld (2 vols. Leipz.: 1913) are at present standard. For prosody, consult L. E. Kastner, History of French Versification (Clarendon Press) and see the references to French versification in Gayley and Scott, § 24. Ph. Martinon's Les Strophes, etc. (noted above, § 5) is a very helpful attempt to classify the lyric forms and suggest their development; the bibliographical account of these forms is particularly valuable. G. Lanson's Manuel bibliographique de la litt. fr. moderne, 1500–1900 (5 vols. Paris: 1909–14) is indispensable. For the medieval period L. Foulet's Bibliography of Medieval French Literature for College Libraries (Yale Univ. Press: 1915) is a compact, convenient guide. J. Le Petit's Bibliographie des principales éditions originales d'écrivains français du XV^{e} au XVII^{e} siècle (Paris: 1888) and F. Lachèvre's Bibliographie des recueils collectifs de poésies publiés de 1597 à 1700 (3 vols. and Suppl. Paris: 1901–05) are helpful works. For other bibliographies of French literature, see H. P. Thieme, Guide bibliographique de la littérature française de 1800 à 1906, and C. H. C. Wright, Hist. of French Literature (1912), p. 883 ff. — Of *anthologies of the French lyric*, Gustave Masson's La lyre française (Lond.: 1867) and Professor Crane's French Lyrics are handy, well-edited, and easily procurable. A small but representative collection is that of The Oxford Book of French Verse, XIIIth Century–XIXth Century (ed. by St. John Lucas, Oxford: 1908). Other anthologies are as follows: Crépet, Les poètes français (4 vols. Paris: 1887); G. Saintsbury, French Lyrics (N.Y.: 1883); H. Carrington, Anthology of French Poetry, 10th to 19th centuries (Lond.: 1900); A. G. Canfield, French Lyrics (N.Y.: 1899). The series known as Grands Écrivains de la France is convenient and authoritative and is supplied with lives, lexica, etc.

A. *The Beginnings.* On traces of early popular dance and festival songs, satirical and religious lyrics, see Gröber's Grundriss, II, 1, p. 444 (noted above, § 5); G. Paris, La litt. française au moyen âge (3d ed. Paris 1905; pp. 191–192). Of French lyric poetry before the middle of the twelfth century little is known (Paris, pp. 193–198; Gröber, p. 475; Ebert, Gesch. d. Litt. d. Mittelalters, vol. III).

B. *The Troubadours* (*1150–c. 1280*).

For the English student the best introduction to the Troubadours may be found in the interesting and popular work of J. H. Smith, The Troubadours at Home (2 vols. N.Y.: 1899; with bibliographical aids), in the concise accounts given by H. J. Chaytor, The Troubadours (Camb. Manuals of Sci. and Lit., Camb. and N.Y.), and Paul Meyer, Art. Provençal Literature, Encyc. Brit., 11th ed. The most important treatises are those of Bartsch, Diez, Gaston Paris, and Jeanroy, mentioned below, under References. Other convenient introductions will be found in G. Paris' La litt. fr. au moyen âge (§§ 125–130; cf. 118–124), J. Anglade's Les Troubadours, etc. (Paris: 1908), and E. Baret's Les Troubadours, etc. (3d ed. Paris: 1867). See also Gröber's Grundriss II, 1, 659 ff., and P. A. Becker's Grundriss der altfranz. Litt. (1907). For troubadour verse, in Italy, Spain, Portugal, and England, see the corresponding national divisions, below.

For *general anthologies*, see: C. Appel, Provenzalische Chrestomathie (4th ed. Leipz.: 1912), and C. A. F. Mahn, Die Werke der Troubadours (Berlin: 1846) and Gedichte der Troubadours (4 vols. Berlin: 1856–73;

inaccurate — criticized in *Romania* 3: 303). An older anthology was published by F. Raynouard, Choix des poésies originales des troubadours (6 vols. Paris: 1816–21). A. Jeanroy; L. Brandin, and P. Aubry have published the Lais et descorts français du XIII^e siècle, including the musical scores (Paris: 1901); and G. Raynaud, a Recueil de motets français des XII^e et XIII^e siècles (2 vols. Paris: 1881–84). See also the Anciennes poésies provençales, Les derniers troubadours de la Provence, Recueil d'anciens textes, etc. of P. Meyer. Extensive collections were made by Auguis, — Les poètes françois, depuis le XII^e siècle jusqu'à Malherbe (6 vols. Paris: 1824), and the Trésor des vieux poètes (14 vols. in 12. Paris: 1877–83). The 6th ed. of the Chrestomathie provençal (1904) of Bartsch and the 2d ed. of V. Crescini's Manualetto provenzale (1905) furnish smaller but convenient and excellent anthologies. An interesting little collection of translations into the Italian, by U. A. Canello, with a preface by Carducci, is published as Fiorita di liriche provenzali (Bologna: 1881). For translations into English see J. H. Smith, as noted, and Barbara Smythe, Trobador Poets (Lond.: 1911). Other bibliographical aid will be found in C. Wahlund's Livres provençaux rassemblés pendant quelques années, etc. (Upsal: 1892). Further account of texts in Chaytor, pp. 142–144.

It is difficult to separate the purely French lyric from the Provençal variety, so closely did the latter influence the former. The student should investigate the relation between the natural popular lyric and the Provençal-French troubadour lyrics. With the latter modern European literature may be said to have begun. Whatever may have been the origin of Provençal troubadour poetry (there are three theories: Latin poetry of the Middle Ages, Arabic poetry of the eighth century, and, most probable, early popular verse in the vernacular), it is as we know it: (1) primarily, though not exclusively, a lyric poetry dealing most of all with love, but also with social, political, and religious questions; (2) a poetry belonging to the upper classes, and, especially in its amatory aspect, expressing a highly artificial society-convention known as *courtoisie*; (3) a poetry that in its capacity for lofty ideas and noble sentiment as well as in its perfection of technique (almost a thousand different stanzaic patterns have been counted), is clearly of high artistic worth, thus implying, perhaps (?), a long period of anterior development. "All the poetry of Europe was penetrated, pervaded, transformed under the action of [this] poetry that radiated from Provence" (Gorra). Its influence in Spain, Portugal, Italy, the north of France, Germany, and England was great, often dominant, not seldom originative.

> The earliest lyric poetry of Italy is Provençal in all but language; almost as much may be said of Portugal and Galicia; Catalonian troubadours continued to write in Provençal until the fourteenth century. The lyric poetry of the "trouvères" in Northern France was deeply influenced in form and spirit by troubadour poetry, and traces of this influence are perceptible even in early middle-English lyrics. Finally, the German minnesingers knew and appreciated troubadour lyrics: imitations or even translations of Provençal poems may be found in Heinrich von Morungen, Friedrich von Hausen, and many others. Hence the poetry of the troubadours is a subject of first-rate importance to the student of comparative literature (Chaytor).

For a brief outline of its influence, see J. H. Smith, II, 374–375, *op. cit. supra*; and paragraphs below, under the Italian, English, and German lyric. — The student will be interested to note the relation of Dante to the troubadours, whom he regarded as his teachers. "Dante was the typical troubadour spiritualized." For the influence of the troubadours in England, see J. F. Rowbotham's The Troubadours and Courts of Love (Lond.: 1895) and Schofield's Eng. Lit. from the Norman Conquest to Chaucer (1906). — The chief lyric forms of the troubadours were the *chanson*, the *aube*, the *pastourelle*, the *tenson* (*débat*), the *rondet* and *ballete*, the *sirventés*, the *motet*, the *lai*, the *virelai*, etc. Most of these, if not all, are characterized not only by emotional expression, but by such a strong narrative or descriptive content that their lyrical quality is distinctly, but not unduly, affected. Have we not here (cf. Greek lyric) an additional datum for the study of the variations by which one type develops into another? In connection with this, see A. Birch-Hirschfeld, Ueber die den . . . Troubadours . . . bekannten epischen Stoffe (Halle: 1878). For references on the lyric species just mentioned, see G. Paris, Litt. fr. moyen âge, pp. 309–310. — The earliest troubadour of whose work we possess any remains is Guillaume IX, Comte de Poitiers (ed. by Jeanroy, Paris: 1913). Professor Ker calls him "the first of a school that includes every modern poet," and observes that "everything that is commonly called poetry in the modern tongues may in some way or other trace its pedigree back to William of Poitiers" (Dark Ages, p. 6). Among the chief troubadours were: Bertran de Born (ed. by A. Stimming, 2d ed. Paris: 1892; by A. Thomas, Toulouse: 1888); Cercamon (ed. by Dejeanne, Toulouse: 1905); Peire Vidal (ed. by K. Bartsch; by J. Anglade, Paris: 1913); Jaufre Rudel (ed. by A. Stimming, Berlin: 1886); Ponz de Capdoill (ed. by M. von Napolski, 1880); Folquet de Romans (ed. by R. Zenker, 1896); Monk of Montaudon (ed. by Klein, 1885); Arnaut Daniel (ed. by U. A. Canello, 1883); Marcabrun (ed. by J. M. L. Dejeanne, Toulouse: 1909); Guiraut de Bornelh (ed. by A. Kolsen, 1894 etc.). The ancient lives of the troubadours, prefixed to early manuscripts, are interesting and instructive. They are collected in Raynouard's Choix de poésies provençales, Mahn's Die Biographieen der Troubadours (1878), and C. Chabaneau's Les biographies des troubadours en langue provençale, etc. (Toulouse: 1885; with bibliography of the works of the troubadours). An English translation is furnished by I. Farnell, The Lives of the Troubadours (Lond.: 1896), which also includes specimens of the lyrics in English form. — Before leaving the study of Troubadour poetry the student should consider the related stream of Latin popular poetry of the 12th and 13th centuries, the *Carmina Burana* (see above, v, E), noting certain similarities of sentiment beneath differences of form and treatment. In the similarities may be found, perhaps, harbingers of the Renaissance (cf. M. B. Ogle, in *Mod. Lang. Notes*, Dec. 1912).

Editions and References. Besides the editions already cited others are mentioned by Bartsch, Gröber, Petit de Julleville, Foulet, etc. The chief literary histories dealing with the troubadours are: K. Bartsch, Grundriss zur Geschichte der provenzalischen Literatur (Elberfeld: 1872; with bibliography of the works of Provençal poets: a new ed.

is in preparation); F. Diez, Leben und Werke der Troubadours (2d ed. Ed. by K. Bartsch, Leipz.: 1882); by the same, Die Poesie der Troubadours (2d ed. Leipz.: 1883); C. Fauriel, Histoire de la poésie provençale (3 vols. Paris: 1846; English trans. by G. J. Adler, N.Y.: 1860, with extended bibliography, including works on Provençal poetry), — the chapter on lyric poetry to be read with much caution; A. Jeanroy, Les origines de la poésie lyrique en France (2d ed. Paris: 1904), — a very valuable work (noted above, § 5), containing bibliographical material, and bearing upon the influence of the troubadours in Italy, Germany, etc.; A. Stimming, Provenzalische Litt. (Gröber's Grundriss). See also the histories of French literature by G. Paris (Lit. fr. au moyen âge, Poésie du m. âge, Orig. de la poésie lyrique en Fr. au m. âge), Petit de Julleville, Lintilhac, Lanson, Demogeot, Brunetière, etc., and Körting's Encyklopädie. The article on Provençal language and literature in the Encyc. Brit. is by P. Meyer; with which compare the same author's De l'influence des troubadours sur la poésie des peuples romans (in *Romania*, 5: 257–268; cf. *Romania*, 12: 521; 19: 1). A. Restori's Letteratura provenzale (Manuali Hoepli, Milan: 1891) is small, but illuminating. See also histories of other European literatures. Other works on the troubadours and their influence, and on the theory of *courtoisie*, are: J. Anglade, Le troubadour Guiraut Réquier, étude sur la décadence de l'ancienne poésie provençale (Diss. Paris: 1905); P. Aubry, Trouvères and Troubadours (1909), English trans. by C. Aveling (N.Y.: 1914), — a helpful introduction to the music of the troubadours and trouvères; K. Bartsch, Nachahmung provenzalischer Poesie im Deutschen (in *Germania*, 1: 480 ff. 1856); J. B. Beck, Die Melodien der Troubadours, etc. (Strassburg: 1908); by the same, La musique des troubadours (Paris: 1910; *Romania* 40: 119); G. Bertoni, Il pianto provenz. in morte di Re Manfredi (in *Romania* 43: 167. 1914); H. Binet, Le style de la lyrique courtoise en France au XII^e^ et XIII^e^ siècles (Paris: 1891; interesting but uncritical); H. Chaytor, The Troubadours of Dante (Oxford: 1902); L. Clédat, La poésie lyrique et satirique en France au moyen âge (Paris: 1893); L. Constans, Chrestomathie de l'ancien Français (IX^e–XV^e siècles) (Paris: 1906), — see pp. 18–19 for a tabulation of the lyric and pastoral; F. Eichelkraut, Der Troub. Folquet de Lunel (1872); E. Faral, Les débats du clerc et du chevalier dans la litt. des 12^e et 13^e siècles (in *Romania* 41: 473. 1912); C. A. Gidel, Les troubadours et Pétrarque (Angers: 1857); E. Gorra, Delle orig. della poesia lirica del medio evo (1895); J. H. Hanford, as noted above, § 5; H. Hensel, Die Vögel in der provenz. und nordfranz. Lyrik des

Mittelalters (in *Romanische Forsch.* 26: 584. 1909); F. Hueffer, The Troubadours (Lond.: 1878), — a helpful work, with chapters on epic, pastorella, alba, serena, balada, sestina, tenso, sirventes, canzo, etc.; by the same, Der Trob. Guilhem de Cabestanh (1869); Knobloch, Die Streitgedichte im Provenz. und Altfranz. (Diss. Breslau: 1886); A. Kolsen, Guiraut von Bornelh (1894); J. de Lescurel, Chansons, Ballades et Rondeaux (Paris: 1855); K. Lewent, Das altprovenz. Kreuzlied (in *Romanische Forsch.* 21: 321. 1908); P. Meyer, Les derniers troubadours de la Provence, — collected, edited, etc. (Paris: 1871); Milà y Fontañals, Los trovadores en España (Barcelona: 1861), the best work on its subject; A. de Montaiglon, Chansons, Ballades et Rondeaux (Paris: 1855); L. F. Mott, The System of Courtly Love (Boston: 1896), and, by the same, The Provençal Lyric (N.Y.: 1901); T. L. Neff, La satire des femmes dans la poésie lyrique française au moyen âge (Paris: 1900); W. A. Neilson, The Origins of the Court of Love (in *Studies and Notes in Phil. and Lit.* VI, 1900); F. Orth, Ueber Reim und Strophenbau in der altfranz. Lyrik (Cassel: 1882); E. Philipson, Der Mönch von Montaudon; H. W. Preston, Troubadours: Their Loves and their Lyrics (Lond.: 1873); C. Sachs, In welchem Zusammenhange steht die lyrische Kunstpoesie der Provenzalen mit der mittelalterl. Kunstpoesie der Franzosen, Italiener, Spanier, Portugiesen und Deutschen? (Progr. Berlin: 1854); M. Sachse, Ueber das Leben und die Lieder des Tr. Wilhelm IX. (1882); an early, quaint, and extremely interesting Histoire littéraire des troubadours, compiled by Sainte-Palaye, edited and published by C. F. X. Millot (Paris: 1774), and translated into English by S. Dobson as the Literary History of the Troubadours (Lond.: 1779), — see the Discours Préliminaire as a document of historical interest; O. Schultz, Das Verhältniss der provenz. Pastourelle zur altfranz. (in *Z. f. roman. Philol.*, VIII, 1884); L. Selbach, Das Streitgedicht in der altprovenzalischen Lyrik, etc. (in *Ausgaben und Abhand. aus dem Gebiete der roman. Philol.*, LVII. Marburg: 1886; cf. *Zeitschr. für vergleich. Littgesch.*, N.F., I, 289); R. Schevill, Ovid and the Renascence in Spain, which is generally valuable for its proof of troubadour indebtedness to Ovid — see especially p. 24 and note 29 — (in *Univ. of California Pubs. in Mod. Philol.*, vol. IV, No. I, 1913); W. Schröttner, Ovid und die Troubadours (Marburg: 1908); H. Springer, Das altprovenz. Klagelied, etc. (in *Berliner Beiträge zur german. und roman. Philol.*, VII. Roman. Abt. No. 2. Berlin: 1895); S. Stronski, Le troubadour Folquet de Marseille, — critical ed., with studies and notes (Cracovie: 1910); R. Zenker, Die provenzalische Tenzone (Leipz.: 1888). — For further bibliography of works on the influence of Provençal poetry, see Betz-Baldensperger, La litt. comparée, Essai bibliog., Chap. VIII (2d ed. Strasbourg: 1904); also the proper bibliographical sections below under the Italian, Portuguese, and English lyric.

C. *The Trouvères (12th-13th centuries, north of France).*

The best introductions to the literature of the Trouvères will be found in Petit de Julleville, vol. I, Chap. V (by A. Jeanroy. Paris: 1896; with bibliography, pp. 403–404); G. Paris, Les origines de la poésie lyrique en France au moyen âge (Paris: 1892; being extracts from the *Journal des Savants*, nov. et déc. 1891, mars et juillet 1892); by the same, La litt. fr. au moyen âge (§§ 118–124); P. Paris, L'Histoire litt. de la France, vol. XXIII, pp. 512–831, Les Chansonniers (Paris: 1856), — a mass of material to be studied in connection with more recent treatises. For bibliography of the literature itself, see G. Raynaud, Bibliographie des chansonniers français des XIII^{e} et XIV^{e} siècles, comprenant la description de tous les manuscrits, la table des chansons classées par ordre alphabétique de rimes et la liste des trouvères (2 vols. Paris: 1884).

In the north of France, epic rather than lyric was the popular literary type during the Middle Ages (cf. below, § 12); but troubadour lyrics were sung in Paris, Champagne, and Blois under the influence of Eleanor of Poitiers and her daughters. The epic-lyric poets of the north were known as Trouvères. Some of the more important were Conon de Béthune, Adam le Bossu, Grace Brulé, Tibaud de Champagne, Gui de Couci, Gautier d'Espinaus, Adam de la Halle, Blondel de Nesle, Richard Cœur de Lion, Gontier de Soignies, Chrétien de Troyes, etc., etc.

Editions. A short bibliography of editions of the Trouvère texts will be found in Julleville or Foulet as noted above. The principal collections and editions are: K. Bartsch, Chrestomathie de l'ancien Français (VIII^{e}–XV^{e} siècles) (11th ed. Leipz.: 1913); by the same, Altfranzösische Romanzen und Pastourellen (Leipz.: 1870), — a charming and scholarly collection of the two earliest kinds of Northern French Lyric; by the same, La langue et la litt. fr. depuis le IX^{e} jusqu'au XIV^{e} siècle, textes, glossaire, grammaire (Paris: 1887); J. Brakelmann, Les plus anciens chansonniers français (Paris: 1870–1891), and another vol., ed. by F. Stengel (1896); L. Constans, Chrestomathie de l'ancien Français (IX^{e}–XV^{e} siècles) (Paris: 1906); E. de Coussemaker, Œuvres complètes du trouvère Adam de la Halle, poésies et musique (Paris: 1872); A. Dinaux, Trouvères, jongleurs et ménestrels du nord de la France et du midi de la Belgique (4 vols.: I, Les trouvères cambrésiens, 1836; II, Les trouvères de la Flandre et du Tournaisis, 1839; III, Les trouvères artésiens, 1843; IV, Les trouvères brabançons, hainuyers, liégeois et namurois, 1863), — a very important and inclusive work; A. Jeanroy, Mélanges d'ancienne poésie lyrique (Toulouse et Paris: 1902); A. Jubinal, Jongleurs et trouvères, etc. (Paris: 1835); E. Maetzner, Altfranzösische Lieder (Berlin: 1853); P. Meyer, Recueil d'anciens textes bas-latins, provençaux et français (2 pts. Paris: 1874–77), — especially important; G. Paris and E. Langlois, Chrestomathie du moyen âge (8th ed. Paris: 1912), — also important; G. Raynaud, Rondeaux . . . du XV^e^ siècle, etc. (Paris: 1889; in Société des anciens textes français, with a masterly introduction); A. Scheler, Trouvères belges du XII^e^ au XIV^e^ siècle (1876), and Nouvelle Série (Bruxelles: 1879); P. Tarbé, Chansons de Thibaut IV, Comte de Champagne et de Brie (Reims: 1851); by the same, Les chansonniers de Champagne aux XII^e^ et XIII^e^ siècles (Reims: 1850); by the same, Les œuvres de Blondel de Nesle (Reims: 1862); W. Wackernagel, Altfranzösische Lieder und Leiche (Bâle: 1846). See also P. Aubry et A. Jeanroy, Le Chansonnier de l'Arsenal (trouvères du XII^e^–XIII^e^ siècle): Reproduction photo-typique du manuscrit 5198 de la Bibliothèque de l'Arsenal (Paris: 1910).

References. For bibliography of critical works, see Julleville, as already noted; Jeanroy, Les origines, etc., 2d ed., pp. IX–XIII, 515–527. Some of the more important monographs, etc., are noted here: P. A. Becker, Grundriss der altfranz. Litt. (Heidelberg: 1907); Bédier, Les fêtes de mai et les commencements de la poésie lyrique au moyen âge (in *Rev. des Deux Mondes*, 1^er^ mai, 1896); J. Brakelmann, Die Pastourelle in der nord- und südfranzösischen Poesie (in *Jahrbuch für rom. und engl. Litt.*, IX, 1868, pp. 155–189, 307–337); Binet, as noted above, under the Troubadours; G. Gröber, Die altfranzösischen Romanzen und Pastourellen (Zürich: 1872); A. Jeanroy, De nostratibus medii aevi poetis qui primum lyrica Aquitaniae carmina imitati sunt (Paris: 1889); by the same, Les origines de la poésie lyrique, — the scholarly work already noted in § 5; H. Knobloch, Die Streitgedichte im Provenzalischen und Altfranzösischen (Diss. Breslau: 1886); P. Meyer, Des rapports de la poésie des trouvères avec celle des troubadours (in *Romania*, 19: 1–62), — all works by Meyer should be consulted carefully; A. Pillet, Studien zur Pastourelle (Breslau: 1902); G. Raynaud, the introduction to the work noted above;

Julian Tiersot, Histoire de la chanson populaire en France (Paris: 1889); M. Wilmotte, Les origines de la chanson populaire, in Études critiques sur la tradition littéraire en France, vol. I (Paris: 1909), — cf. La chanson populaire au moyen âge (in the *Bulletin of Folk-Lore*, I, 1891). For bibliography of the music of the lyrics, see H. Lavoix, Musique au siècle de Saint Louis, pp. 467–479 (in the 2d vol. of G. Raynaud's Recueil de motets français des XII^{e} et XIII^{e} siècles, 2 vols., Paris: 1881–1883); J. Tiersot, Histoire de la chanson populaire en France (Paris: 1889); P. Aubry, Trouvères and Troubadours, trans. by C. Aveling (N.Y.: 1914); further bibliography may be found in the annual bibliographical tables of the *Vierteljahrsschrift für Musikwissenschaft.*

D. *Norman Trouvères.*

On Norman literature and language, Hermann Suchier's Bibliotheca Normannica is of great value (Reimpredigt. Ed. by Suchier. Halle: 1879). Another useful collection is the Altfranzösische Bibliothek (Ed. by Wendelin Foerster. Heilbronn: 1879): vols. I–III contain poems in the Anglo-Norman dialect of the 13th century; vols. IV–VI the Lothringian Psalter of the 14th century. Bartsch and Horning's La langue et la littérature françaises, IX^{e}–XIV^{e} siècle (Paris: 1887) covers best the period indicated. The critical student is referred also to the authorities cited by Bartsch in his Geschichte der proven. Literatur, and to the excellent studies published in the *Zeitschr. für romanische Philologie*, and in *Romania*. The following will also be helpful: A. Gasté, Chansons normands du XV^{e} siècle (Caen: 1866); A. Heron, Trouvères normands (Rouen: 1885); G. de La Rue, Essais, . . . sur les bardes, les jongleurs et les trouvères normands et anglo-normands (3 vols. Caen: 1834).

E. *Medieval Religious Lyric.*

See G. Paris, Litt. fr. moyen âge, pp. 257–260, 320; and his La poésie du moyen âge (2 vols., 1887); also, Ebert, vol. III; and Gröber.

F. *Fourteenth and Fifteenth Centuries.*

A full and admirable review of this period is contained in Gröber's article on French literature in his Grundriss, II, 1; see also G. Paris as already noted, and the general histories of French literature. Besant's Studies in Early French Poetry (1868) and Petit de Julleville's La poésie lyrique au 14^{e} siècle (in *Rev. des cours et conférences*, April, May, July, 1893) should also be noted.

The work of the Troubadours and Trouvères extends into this period, but the acme of their power and literary production was reached in the earlier century. During the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries a loss of creative power is to be noted, an elaboration of verse technique, and the use of lyric measures in didactic and satirical poems. But what most interests the student is the outcropping of the personal note. The lyric of *courtoisie* was related to narrative and, in general, objective themes, and the personality of the poet, when it did rarely appear, showed more by accident than by design. But during this period poets like Machaut and Deschamps begin to sing of their own affairs, and then, as a further step in the same direction, Villon (Œuvres, Paris: 1911) gives an ever-haunting lyric expression to self-analysis. What significance is there in the fact that the personal note develops in an age of poetic decline? Can the same be shown of lyric development in other nations? The chief forms of the lyric of this age were the *ballade* (especially common: Deschamps composed more than a thousand), *lai*, *virelai*, *chant royal*, *rondeau*, *rondel*, *sirventés*, and *villanelle*. The other chief poets were Olivier Basselin (convivial songs, *vaux-de-vire*, whence *vaudeville*), Christine de Pisan, Charles d'Orléans ("last of the trouvères"), Alain Chartier, and Guillaume Crétin. See editions, general histories, etc.

An informing article is that of G. Doutrepont, La litt. fr. à la cour des Ducs de Bourgogne (Paris: 1909; in the *Bibliothèque du XV^e siècle*, vol. VIII). V. Chichmaref's Guillaume de Machaut, Poésies lyriques (2 vols. 1910), contains a good introduction. On Villon see G. Paris, François Villon (Paris: 1901, — Coll. des grands écrivains), and P. Champion, F. Villon, sa vie et son temps (2 vols. Paris: 1913). Champion has also published La vie de Charles d'Orléans (Paris: 1911). The Poésies complètes of D'Orléans have been edited, with preface, notes, and glossary, by C. d'Héricault (2 vols. Paris: 1896). On troubadour verse see A. Parducci, La pastorella in Francia nei secoli XV–XVI (in *Zeitschr. f. roman. Phil.* 34: 55. 1910). On Basselin's reputed authorship of the *vaux-de-vire* see a monograph by M. V. Patard (1897). Most of the material of a recent sort on this period is contained in the various periodicals, for which see Appendix. For the imitation of old French lyric forms in English poetry, see below, XI, F.

G. *The Sixteenth Century.*

An excellent brief introduction to the history of the lyric of the century will be found in H. Morf's Geschichte der neuern französischen Litteratur, vol. I (Strassburg: 1898). See §§ 9–13 of the work for Marot, Des Périers, M. de St.-Gelais (who perhaps introduced the sonnet into French poetry), Labé, Héroet, etc., and the popular poetry of the time; §§ 16–23 for the Pléiade and later folk-verse; and p. 228 ff. for a bibliographical appendix. A later and exhaustive study has been begun by Henri Guy (Hist. de la poésie fr. au XVI^e^ siècle. Vol. I, Paris: 1910). Tilley's work, in English, is mentioned below. General collections are also noted below, under Editions.

To Clément Marot (c. 1495–1544), a graceful and popular writer of occasional verse, the inventor of the old French verse-form of the madrigal (on which see the references under W. A. Barrett as given below, XI, C, References) and sometimes called the father of modern French poetry, has been attributed by a recent writer (see above, § 5, Ph. Martinon) the making over of medieval French prosody into the instrument of the modern French lyric. This transformation has usually been attributed to Ronsard. At any rate, the work of Marot and his contemporaries, though reminiscent of both the vernacular and Latin lyric of the Middle Ages, was yet so different and so modernized as to prepare the way for the next step in advance. This was taken by the Pléiade, which set up in opposition to the older popular lyric forms, now scornfully denominated *épisseries*, modified forms and standards of classical derivation. For the Pléiade, see above, § 3, IV, B, and below, § 9, VI, A, where additional references are indicated. The manifesto of the Pléiade was Du Bellay's La deffence et illustration de la langue françoyse (1549), which is described elsewhere. What is particularly significant is the fact that with this assertion of classical standards the evolution of the lyric is rendered complex by what might be called cross-fertilization from foreign models. And these foreign models were even more highly developed than the native French-Provençal lyric itself, by which many hundreds of stanzaic forms had been evolved. In other words, we are confronted with the phenomenon, henceforth to be common, of the lyric of a highly advanced stage influenced in turn by alien lyric, also of a highly developed stage. The results in such cases are to be ascertained by induction from authenticated facts, not *a priori*. Special attention should be given to the rise of imitations of classic forms, such as the ode, epigram, and elegy. For instance, to what degree did Ronsard misconceive the character of the Pindaric ode? And how does a new type, or variety, of the ode develop under this misconception? What, exactly stated, are the details of variation, — in terms of form, ornament, idea, etc.? Can it be shown by comparative study that these details are parallelled in other cases of cross-fertilization? In other words, can a law of variation be determined? How is the new variety expressive of its age? Does it appear, when set beside Pindar's sublime strophes, to be but a rustic and ridiculous imitation? or has it the dignity of a vital creation, expressive of the spiritual outlook of a new age? Was Ronsard familiar with the Pindaric hymns of Luigi Alamanni (published 1533)? Is he at all indebted for the form of his Pindaric odes to earlier French poets (see Ph. Martinon, 38 ff.)? Extending such studies the investigator will examine the indebtedness of the Pléiade to the various classical poets, particularly Horace, Virgil, and Ovid. What also of an indebtedness to Latin Christian poetry? To what extent did the earlier poets of the century, especially Marot, employ classical forms? From the ascertained *facts* of imitation one may attempt by induction to come at the *laws* of imitation that govern the rise of the new variety or type. — Another subject for research is the introduction (by Marot or Mellin de St.-Gelais? See Tilley, Lit. of French Renaissance, I, 152–153) and development of the sonnet. This opens up the study of Italian influences. The century, indeed, is the period of Italian-Renaissance influence, and the student cannot fully understand French lyric development until he has paid attention to the influence of Petrarch and other Italian lyrists. — In this period, too, the historical relation of the development of a self-conscious poetic diction to the advance and sophistication of the lyric demands systematic investigation.

Under just what complex of contributing causes in this instance does the development take place? Can this complex of causes be shown to be similar to that which has elsewhere operated to produce like results? Is there any relation between the development of the personal note and the growth of this self-conscious diction? What enriching or impoverishing effect has such cross-fertilization, or such invention of poetic diction, on the species as judged from the point of view of later centuries?

The chief lyric writers of the latter half of the period were Ronsard, Du Bellay, Remi Belleau, Daurat, Baïf, Jodelle, Pontus de Tyard, and the women poets of the Lyons school. For a list of the poets before the Pléiade, of Marot and his contemporaries, see Saintsbury's Short Hist. of Fr. Lit., Bk. II, Chap. II; for some of Ronsard's followers in the Pindaric ode, see Ph. Martinon, p. 458.

Editions and Translations. Editions of the various poets are easily accessible in any university library; for bibliography see Morf, Tilley, Saintsbury, etc. A convenient *anthology* is G. Pellissier's Morceaux choisis des poètes du XVI^e siècle (Paris: 1897). A larger collection is that of A. de Montaiglon and J. de Rothschild, Anciennes poésies françaises, etc. (13 vols. Paris: 1855–88). English collections and translations will be found in Besant's Early French Poetry (1868), H. F. Cary's Early French Poets (1846), L. S. Costello's Specimens of the Early Poetry of France (1835), Father Prout's Reliques (1836), and A. Lang's Ballads and Lyrics of Old France (Lond.: 1872).

References. Among the monographs that deal with the period as a whole special attention may be called to Tilley's The Literature of the French Renaissance, which contains classified bibliographies in addition to excellent historical and critical material. Concerning one of the most charming of the works on the period, a word of caution should be uttered. Sainte-Beuve's Tableau historique et critique de la poésie française et du théâtre français au XVI^e siècle (Paris: 1828) was written under the inspiration of what the Germans call a *Tendenz.* By emphasizing the romantic qualities of Du Bellay, Ronsard, and the other Renaissance poets, Sainte-Beuve aimed to afford historical support to the French romantic school of the nineteenth century. The student, therefore, will be careful not to be misled by the enthusiasm and by the colored criticisms of the work. — E. Gandar's Ronsard considéré comme imitateur de Homère et de Pindare (Metz: 1854) is of value for the comparative study of the period, as is also E. Stemplinger's Ronsard und der Lyriker Horaz (in *Zeitschr. für franz. Sprache*, 26: 70 ff.). A recent work is G. Wyndham's Ronsard and the Pléiade (1906). See also: E. Berthelin, Étude sur Amadis Jamyn, poète du XVI^e siècle, etc. (Troyes: 1859); H. Chamard, Ioachim du Bellay (Lille: 1900); by the same, L'Invention de l'"Ode" et le différend de Ronsard et du Bellay (in *Rev. d'hist. litt. de la France*, 6: 21–54. 1899); L. Clément, Henri Estienne, etc. (Paris: 1899); C. Comte et P. Laumonier, Ronsard et les musiciens du XVI^e siècle (*Rev. d'hist. litt. de la France*, 7: 341–381. 1900); F. Flamini, Du rôle de Pontus de Tyard dans le pétrarquisme français (*Rev. de la Renaissance*, 1901, pp. 42–55; also Padova: 1902); J. B. Fletcher, Areopagus and Pleiade (in *Jr. Eng. and Germ. Phil.*, 2: 429. 1898); H. Guy, De fontibus Clementis Maroti poetae (Diss. Paris: 1898); by the same, Les sources françaises de Ronsard (*Rev. d'hist. litt. de la France*, 10: 217–256. 1902); J.-P.-A. Jeandet, Étude sur le 16^e siècle (Paris: 1860); P. Laumonier, articles on Ronsard in *Rev. d'hist. litt. de la France* (9: 29–87, 441–447), and *Rev. de la Renaissance* (1901–2); A. Lefranc, Le platonisme dans la littérature en France à l'époque de la Renaissance, 1500–1550 (*Rev. d'hist. litt. de la France*, 3: 1–44. 1896); cf. by the same, Marguerite de Navarre et le platonisme de la Renaissance (*Bibliothèque de l'École des Chartes*, 58: 259–292; 59: 712–757); H. Longnon, Pierre de Ronsard (Paris: 1912); Abbé C. Marchand, De Graecarum litterarum studio apud Andegavos in XVI saeculo (Paris: 1889), — see Chap. IV on the imitation of Greek poets by Bellay, Baïf, etc.; O. Mucha, Ueber Stil und Sprache von Philippe Desportes (Hamburg: 1896); M. Piéri, Le pétrarquisme au XVI^e siècle, Pétrarque et Ronsard (Marseilles: 1895); C.-A. Sainte-Beuve, Joachim du Bellay (in Nouveaux Lundis, XIII, 266–356. Paris: 1870; or in *Journal des Savants*, 1867, avril 205–221, juin 344–359, août 483–503); J. Vianey, Le modèle de Ronsard dans l'ode pindarique (*Rev. d. langues rom.*, Sept. Oct., 1900), L'Influence italienne chez les précurseurs de la Pléiade (*Ann. Bordeaux*, *Bull. Ital.*, II. 1903), and Le pétrarquisme en France au XVI^e siècle (Montpellier-Paris: 1909; see a review of this work, by E. Pèrcopo, in *Rassegna crit. della lett. ital.*, 14: 235–258). Other articles can be found in the various periodicals; see especially the *Revue de la Renaissance, Organe international mensuel des amis de la Pléiade.*

For the *Sonnet* of this age, see the works of Vaganay and Veyrières, cited above, § 5; also, Morf, on M. de St.-Gelais, in his Gesch. der neuern franz. Litt., vol. I; C. Asselineau, Histoire du sonnet pour servir à l'histoire de la poésie française (2d ed. Alençon: 1856); A. Morel-Fatio, Hist. de deux sonnets, in Études sur l'Espagne, 3e Série (Paris: 1904), — on the derivation of a sonnet by Du Bellay; M. Pfänzel, Ueber die Sonette des J. Du Bellay nebst einer Einleitung: Die Einführung des Sonetts in Frankreich (Inaug. Diss. Leipz.: 1898); A. H. Upham, The French Influence in English Literature, Chap. III (N.Y.: 1908); J. Vianey, Les origines du sonnet régulier (in *Rev. de la Renaissance*, 1903). — For the *Popular Lyric*, see J. B. Weckerlin, L'Ancienne chanson populaire en France, XVIe et XVIIe siècle (Paris: 1877). For the *influence of the Pléiade in England*, S. Lee, The French Renaissance in England, Book IV (Lond.: 1910); A. H. Upham, French Influence in English Lit. from the Accession of Elizabeth to the Restoration (N.Y.: 1908); L. Charlanne, L'Influence française en Angleterre au 17e siècle (Paris: 1906); papers by L. E. Kastner (in *Mod. Lang. Rev.*, 1907–10).

H. *The Seventeenth Century.*

For works dealing with the period, consult the Appendix; and compare the outline of the criticism of the time given above, § 3, IV, C. J. Vianey's Mathurin Régnier (Paris: 1896) is an important work. See also Deschanel's Le romantisme des classiques, Boileau et Perrault (Paris: 1883); G. Lanson's Boileau (Paris: 1892); G. Lafenestre's La Fontaine (1895); É. Faguet's Les grands maîtres du XVIIe siècle (Paris: 1887), and Dix-sept. siècle, études litt. (Paris: 1893); and M. Souriau's L'Évolution du vers français au XVIIIe siècle (Paris: 1893). The Recueil des plus belles pieces des poëtes françois, by Bernard de Fontenelle (5 vols. Paris: 1692, — commonly known, from the name of the publisher, as the Recueil de Barbin), is an early collection of poems from Villon to Benserade. Selections from the poets may be found in Crepet's Les poètes français.

The Pléiade fell into extremes and absurdities, and Malherbe undertook to remedy matters. Under his severe tenets the lyric became mechanical and oratorical. The genius of Régnier, however, was too natural and original to be fettered by the grammarian. The second half of the century, under the more catholic sway of Boileau, was likewise not rich in lyric production. The ode, fondly called Pindaric, became the reigning lyric fashion. The period as a whole was cold and formal, too 'classical' in its literary tendencies to admit of great lyric fervor. The critics were fond of insisting on the purity of poetic genius required by the ode, and on the reasoned abandon of the lyric poet. The poets were more capable of the reason than of the abandon. La Fontaine's 'lyric' measures, — to some extent an exception to these general statements (see Brunetière's Manual of French Lit., p. 188. N.Y.: 1898), — should be examined.

I. *The Eighteenth Century.*

The chief aid is to be found in the various literary histories of the period, for which see the Appendix. A convenient anthology is Poitevin's Petits poètes français (2 vols. Paris: 1838). The relation of the *Encyclopédie* to literary movements is noted in Rocafort's Les doctrines littéraires de l'Encyclopédie (Paris: 1890). On the Salons, and their influence, see Julleville (vol. VI, Chap. VIII, Bibliography, p. 444). Sainte-Beuve has essays upon many of the minor poets of the century (detailed references in Julleville, vol. VI, p. 677). There are monographs on J.-B. Rousseau by Auger and by Amar; on Gresset, by Cayrol and by Wogue; on Boufflers, by Tascherau; on Rouget de Lisle, by Tiersot. For works on Chénier, see Julleville (vol. VI, p. 678).

Interests were intellectual rather than emotional, and the eclipse of the lyric lasted till the outbreak of the Revolution (cf., above, § 3, IV, D). The student may regard the frigid performances of J.-B. Rousseau and Lebrun, whom their contemporaries compared with Pindar. Nothing better reveals the aesthetic temper of the time than this perverted conception of Pindar. For emotion, literary emotion is substituted; and neither French poet nor critic seems to be aware of the fact. Is there not in such a circumstance a suggestion both of a typical stage in the history of the lyric and of a basis of classification for the type? Such a stage as this is found in many, perhaps all, of the European literatures. Is there anything of the kind in Greek lyric history? in the oriental lyric?

Artificiality of subject and passion and constant triviality characterize the lyrics of Bernard, Bernis, Bertin, Dorat, Grécourt, Gresset, Parny, Piron, etc. Toward the end of the century, with the song of battle in Marie-Joseph Chénier's Chanson du Départ and Rouget de Lisle's La Marseillaise (1792), the natural lyric again emerged. The elegies and idyls of the greater Chénier

(André), should be considered under the types to which they belong. For a collection of some of the popular poetry of the century, see É. Raunié, Chansonnier historique du XVIII^{e} siècle, which has an introduction, commentary, and notes (10 vols. Paris: 1879–84).

J. *The Nineteenth Century.*

The best introductions to the absorbingly interesting lyric developments of this century will be found in Brunetière's L'Évolution de la poésie lyrique en France au XIX^{e} siècle (2 vols. Paris: 1894) and G. Pellissier's The Literary Movement in France during the Nineteenth Century (English trans. by A. C. Brinton. N.Y.: 1897; pp. 150–213, 339–384). See also, G. Brandes, The Romantic School in France (being vol. V of the author's Main Currents in Nineteenth Century Literature. Eng. trans. 6 vols. N.Y.: 1901–05); and the suggestions and references given above, § 3, IV, E.

After a few uncertain starts during the first Empire (Fontanes, Chênedollé, Millevoye, etc.) the lyric, from 1820 on, was fecundated by the subjectivity and creative imagination of Romanticism. The modern flowering of the French lyric followed. This is the period of Lamartine, Vigny, Hugo, Musset, Gautier, — the period of revolt against classical formulae, magisterial discipline of the emotions, traditional propriety of material and type, ideal and style, — the period of democratic sympathy and personal freedom, of imagination, romantic passion, and sometimes sentimentality, of vivid, colored, and wayward diction, of spiritual yearnings and sweeping melodies of rhythm, of metres novel and diversified. The student should give attention to the lyrical implications of the romantic movement as a whole, — its essentially lyric genius. In historical survey he will notice particularly the relations of the early romantic lyric (that of the troubadours, and the popular lyric of Villon) to the more consciously artistic lyric of the romantic school; then trace the process by which the latter, opening with the spontaneity and deep passion of Lamartine, the dynamic originality of Vigny, the democratic idealism and power of Hugo, the self-revealing effrontery of Musset, the enthusiasm of Gautier, passed through intellectualism and imaginative reaction to the ultra-refinement and straining after unnatural effect of the end of the century. What other influences — political, social, commercial, religious, philosophical — contributed to the sophistication of the imagination, and in what degree were they, in their general emotional effect, peculiarly susceptible of lyric expression? This field of inquiry, the consideration of which will do much to clear up the nature of lyric development, includes a host of subsidiary but fascinating questions dealing with the details of the history of the romantic school, — questions of initiative in this and that phase of the movement, of derivation from this or that author of the past, of international influences, of relation to oriental literatures, etc. Unfortunately, investigators frequently neglect to show the relation of their findings to the larger questions of literary evolution. Specific studies are useful in themselves, but unless a bearing upon the greater problems is established there results a gossipy, or a pedantic, and Alexandrian scholarship against which the student must be constantly on his guard.

In addition to the lyrists mentioned above, Delavigne also — though but a half-hearted romantic — should be studied. Béranger occupies a place of his own.

From about 1866 dates a classical reaction against the looseness of form and content that had prevailed among the Romanticists. Of the *Parnasse Contemporain*, which aimed at a more rational inspiration, accuracy of form, and aesthetic effects in style, Leconte de Lisle and Gautier were the precursors; and among its poets are Baudelaire, Banville, the Cuban José-Maria de Heredia, and, though not entirely devoted to the movement, Sully Prudhomme and Coppée.

Following upon the Parnassiens, about 1885, came the Symbolistes or Décadents, — a movement of dexterous mysticism and "sentimental religiosity," too recent for satisfactory historical investigation.

Editions. There are two very convenient *anthologies* of the lyrics of the century: A. van Bever and P. Léautaud, Poètes d'aujourd'hui 1880–1900 (19th ed. 2 vols. Paris: 1908); G. Walch, Anthologie des poètes français contemporains 1866–1906 (3 vols. Paris: 1906–07). Both collections are provided with biographies, and with bibliographical notes by means of which editions of the poets of the age are easily traced.

References. In dealing with the earlier part of the century Sainte-Beuve's Chateaubriand et son groupe littéraire sous l'Empire (Paris: 1860) will be found intimate and stimulating, but not directly of much aid to the systematic student. See also C. A. Sainte-Beuve, Tableau historique de la poésie française au XVI^e siècle (2d ed. 2 vols. 1838; éd. définitive, Paris: 1876), Critiques et portraits littéraires (5 vols. 1836–39), Portraits littéraires (2 vols. 1844), Portraits contemporains (3 vols. 1847), Causeries du Lundi (2d ed. 15 vols. 1852–62–[81]), Nouveaux Lundis (13 vols. 1863–72), Premiers Lundis (3 vols. 1874–75); De Lescure, Chateaubriand (1892); A. Bardoux, Chateaubriand (1893). E. Zyromski's Lamartine, poète lyrique (Paris: 1897) derives Lamartine's lyric genius from the Bible, Chateaubriand, Ossian, Petrarch, and Italy; but the author is content to keep close to his particular poet. Compare G. Brandes, Lyric Poetry, Lamartine and Hugo (being Chap. IX of vol. III of Brandes' Main Currents in 19th Cent. Lit.); C. de Pomairols, Lamartine, Étude de morale et d'esthétique (Paris: 1889); É. Deschanel, Lamartine (2 vols. Paris: 1893); É. Rod, Lamartine (Paris: 1893); and G. Lanson's valuable introduction and notes to his edition of the Méditations (2 vols. 1916). Material on Hugo's lyric genius will be found in E. Dupuy, Victor Hugo (New ed. Paris: 1890), and C. Renouvier, Victor Hugo (4th ed. Paris: 1902); compare Swinburne, Hugo's Toute la Lyre, in Studies in Prose and Verse (N.Y.: 1894). See also: E. Biré, Victor Hugo avant 1830 (Paris: 1883); by the same, Victor Hugo après 1830 (Paris: 1891); J. Sarrazin, Deutsche Stimmen üb. d. franz. Lyrik, etc. (in *Franco-Gallia*, II, 1885); by the same, Victor Hugo und d. deutsche Kritik (in *Archiv*, 1885); L. Mabilleau, Victor Hugo (Paris: 1893). P. de Musset, Biographie de Alfred de Musset (New ed. Paris: 1879); A. Claveau, Alfred de Musset; and A. Barine's Musset (Paris: 1893). A. France, Alfred de Vigny (1868); E. Tissot, La poésie de Vigny (1887); M. Paléologue, Alfred de Vigny (Paris: 1891); Dorison, Alfred de Vigny: poète et philosophe (Paris: 1892). É. Bergerat, Théophile Gautier (Paris: 1879); M. du Camp, Théophile Gautier (Paris: 1890). A. de Grisy, Lucilius et Béranger, etc. (Nîmes, Paris: 1876); R. Giuriani, Béranger und die deutsche Lyrik (Mailand: 1902). Among general references may also be consulted: É. Montégut, Nos morts contemporains (Paris: 1833); G. Planche, Portraits littéraires (Paris: 1836); H. Leuthold, Einfluss der deutschen Litt. auf die neuere franz. Lyrik (in *Süddeutsche Ztg.*, 14, 15. Oct. 1859); M. Spronck, Les artistes littéraires (Paris: 1889); J. Texte, W. Wordsworth et la poésie lakiste en France (in *Rev. d. D. M.*, 15 juillet 1896), — also in the author's Études de litt. europ. (Paris: 1898). Other works on the Romanticists exist in profusion and are not difficult of location in any library of fair size. Much material will be found in the literary periodicals of the time. Scholars would be deeply indebted to any student who would compile a list, properly annotated and indexed, of the literary criticism of the French magazines of the nineteenth century.

On the *Symbolistes* the following are of various value, many of them speaking *ex parte*: A. Beaunier, La poésie nouvelle (Paris: 1902); P. de Bouchaud, Considération sur quelques écoles poétiques contemporaines (Paris: 1903) — considers prosody; R. de Gourmont, Le livre de masques: portraits symbolistes (3d ed. 2 vols. Paris: 1896–98) — appreciative; J. Huret, Enquête sur l'évolution littéraire (Paris: 1894); V. Pica, Letteratura d'eccezione (Milano: 1898); A. Symons, The Symbolist Movement in Literature (Lond.: 1899; with bibliography of the Symbolists); V. Thompson, French Portraits (Boston: 1900); E. Vigié-Lecocq, La poésie contemporaine 1884–1896 (Paris: 1897); M. Wilmotte, Études critiques sur la tradition littéraire en France (Paris: 1909).

On *contemporary lyric poets*, see T. de Visan, L'attitude du lyrisme contemporain (Paris: 1912), — notices of Francis Viélé-Griffin, Henri de Régnier, Émile Verhaeren, Maurice Maeterlinck, Paul Fort, Adrien Milhouard, Robert de Souza, Albert Mockel, Maurice Barrès, André Gide, Novalis, H. Bergson.

On French *patriotic poetry*, see C. Lenient, La poésie patriotique en France au moyen âge (1891), La poésie patriotique en France (2 vols. 1894).

An interesting revival of *Provençal poetry* began in the earlier part of the century with Jacques Jasmin. See short studies of his works by Sainte-Beuve, Charles Nodier, and Pontmartin. See also the organ of the revival, the *Revue Félibréenne* (Paris: 1885 +). Mistral's work also belongs to this revival, but it is epical in nature: see C. A. Downer, Frédéric Mistral (N.Y., Columbia University: 1901); W. Sharp, The Modern Troubadours (*Quart. Rev.*, 1900).

K. *French Popular Poetry.* Since the middle of the nineteenth century students have paid much attention to French popular verse, though the latter has never affected the development of literary verse as the popular ballad affected English and German literary verse. A very brief introduction to the history of the study is prefixed to Professor Crane's Chansons populaires de la France (N.Y.: 1905). A history of these songs and ballads has been written by Julien Tiersot (Histoire de la chanson populaire en France. Paris: 1889). See also W. Scheffler, Die franz. Volksdichtung u. Sage (2 vols. Leipz.: 1885); A. Thimme, Zur Charakteristik der franz. und deut. Volkslieder (in *Rev. francoallem.*, III, 1901); De Beaurepaire-Froment, Bibliog. d. chants pop. fr.

There are many collections, some of which have already been mentioned under the various centuries considered above. The following will afford representative material, and the student will find little difficulty in extending the list: D. Arbaud, Chants populaires de la Provence (2 vols. Aix: 1862–64), and L. Lambert, Chants et chansons populaires du Languedoc (2 vols. Paris: 1906); J. F. Bladé, Poésies populaires en langue française recueillies dans l'Armagnac et l'Agenais (Paris: 1879); by the same, Poésies populaires de la Gascogne (3 vols. Paris: 1881); J. Bujeaud, Chants et chansons populaires des provinces de l'ouest (2 vols. Niort: 1895); Champfleury et Wekerlin, Chansons populaires des provinces de France (Paris: 1860); H. Carnoy, Littérature orale de la Picardie (Paris: 1883); L. Decombe, Chansons populaires recueillies dans le département d'Ille-et-Vilaine (Rennes: 1884); J. Fleury, Littérature orale de la Basse-Normandie (Paris: 1883); C. Guillon, Chansons populaires de l'Ain (Paris: 1883); Gérard du Nerval, Chansons et ballades populaires du Valois (1885); E. Rolland, Recueil de chansons populaires (5 vols. Paris: 1883–87); J. B. T. Weckerlin, L'ancienne chanson populaire en France (Paris: 1887), Chansons populaires du pays de France (Paris: 1903), and other works; Doncieux, Romancéro populaire de la France (1904), with full bibliography of romance ballad poetry; and others by Haupt, Daymard, Puymaigre, Soleville, Tarbé, Bujeaud, Jeanroy, etc. The Chansons nationales et populaires de France of Dumersan and Noël Ségur (2 vols. Paris: 1866) gives a collection of the *chansonniers*, which are songs mostly of bacchic revelry. See also Dumersan's Chants et chansons pop. de la France (Paris: 1890?).

VIII. **The Italian Lyric.**

For general introduction to the history of the Italian lyric, see the principal histories of Italian literature mentioned in the Appendix; and for bibliography, the appropriate sections of the Notizia Bibliografica in F. Flamini's Compendio di storia della letteratura italiana (Livorno: 1914), pp. 327–392, and D' Ancona-Bacci as mentioned below. There is no one work of any size or importance covering exclusively the lyrical domain. Monographs on particular periods and movements are cited at the appropriate places in the following outline. Further references may be found in the periodical reviews of Italian literature, mentioned in the Appendix. A valuable *anthology* of the Italian lyric from the year 1200 on is furnished in The Oxford Book of Italian Verse (ed. St. John Lucas: Clarendon Press). D' Ancona and Bacci's Manuale della letteratura italiana (6 vols. Firenze: 1908), with its admirable selections and exhaustive bibliographical notes, is indispensable to the student. Several collections of the lyrics of the earlier centuries have been made, such as: E. Monachi, Chrestomazia ital. dei primi secoli, etc., through the 13th century (Castello: 1889); G. Carducci, Primavera e fiore d. lirica ital. (Firenze: 1903), and Ant. lirica ital., 13th to 15th centuries (Firenze: 1907); Lirica ital. antica: scelta di rime dei sec. XIII–XV, etc., under the management of Levi (Firenze: 1905), and from the same, Lirica ital. nel Cinquecento e nel Seicento (1909); older collections by L. Allaci (Napoli: 1661), L. Valeriani (Firenze: 1816), March. di Villarosa (Palermo: 1817), F. Trucchi (Prato: 1846–47), and Anon., Saggio di rime (Firenze: 1825), — all of which, together with the general collections of Italian texts, are noted by Flamini, pp. 329–330. A list of manuscripts containing ancient lyrics in the vernacular is compiled in G. B. Festa's Bibliografia delle più antiche rime volgari italiane (in *Roman. Forsch.* 25: 2). For the popular verse of the 13th and 14th centuries see G. Carducci, Cantilene e ballate, strambotti e madrigali dei sec. XIII e XIV (Pisa: 1871). The student should also consult the references to Italian poetics and versification in Gayley and Scott, §§ 21, B, 5, and 24, B, 8, and to the historical development of Italian theory of the lyric, § 3, III of this volume.

A. *The Beginnings.* On the existence in Italy during the Middle Ages of popular poetry in Latin see Rubieri, Storia della poesia popolare italiana (1877) and F. Novati, Origini della lingua (vol. II of Storia lett. d' Italia); and compare other works on ancient and modern Italian popular poetry by D' Ancona (La poesia popolare italiana, 1878, 1906; Studi sulla letteratura dei primi secoli, 1884), O. Badke (Das ital. Volk im Spiegel seiner Volkslieder, 1879), A. Bartoli (I primi due secoli della letteratura italiana, 1880), G. A. Cesareo (Le origini della poesia lirica in Italia, Catania: 1899), E. Gorra (Delle origini della poesia lirica del medio evo, Torino: 1895), Novati (La canzone popolare in Francia e Italia nel più alto medio evo, in Wilmotte's Mélanges. Paris: 1909), F. D'Ovidio (Versificazione ital. e arte poetica medievale, Milano: 1910), and C. Pascal (Poesia latina medievale, Catania: 1907; Letteratura latina medievale, Catania: 1909). See also Ebert, vol. III; Manitius, Gesch. lat. Litt. Mittelalt.; and various articles on neo-latin medieval lyrics in the *Studi Medievali.*

B. *The Twelfth Century.* In the twelfth century we find Latin Goliardic verse, — as above, V, E and F. But this interesting testimony to the happy sensuousness of medievalism is European rather than Italian in its scope. Cipolla's Catullo nel medio evo (in *Archivio Veneto*, 1887) suggests another line of research.

C. *The Thirteenth Century.*

On this period as a whole see G. Bertoni, Il Duecento (in Storia lett. d'Italia), A. Bartoli, Primi due secoli della letteratura italiana (Milano: 1884), and the various histories of Italian literature cited in the Appendix. Bertoni and Flamini offer convenient bibliographical aid. On the origin of the Italian lyric see the references given above, under A; also G. Bertoni, Le origini della lirica italiana (in *Nuova antologia*, May 1, 1910); E. Monaci, Elementi francesi nella più antica lirica italiana, in Miscellanea Fedele (1907); G. A. Cesareo, Le origini della poesia lirica in Italia (Catania: 1899; cf. A. Jeanroy, in *Romania* 29: 128). Torraca's Studi su la lirica italiana del duecento (Bologna: 1902) is helpful.

In the last quarter of the 12th century Provençal influence had begun to be felt in northern Italy. Among the Italian troubadours who wrote in the Provençal dialect were Alberto Malaspina, Rambertino Buvalelli, Bonifacio Calvo, Lanfranco Cigala, Bartolommeo Zorzi, and the famed Sordello. But it was not until near the end of the first quarter of the 13th century, at the court of Frederick II at Palermo, that lyrics in *Italian* were produced after the Provençal models, — "the earliest undoubted examples of vernacular Italian literature." Thus the native Sicilian school came into prominence: see the troubadour lyrics of Pier delle

Vigne, Jacopo d' Aquino, Rugieri Pugliese, Jacopo da Lentino, Guido and Otto delle Colonne, Arrigo Testa d' Arezzo, etc. The poetry of this school owes to its imitative origin its mechanical uniformity and its poverty of sentiment. A comparison of the Sicilian lyric with Provençal poetry at its best will reveal some of the signs that may uniformly characterize the parasitic lyric, if so we may name all slavishly imitative poetry of the kind. Also worthy of consideration is the probability of the early Italian *canzone* having been influenced by the German *Minnelied.* With the fall of the Hohenstaufen dynasty the Sicilian school came to an end, a little after the middle of the century. But its influence had spread to the north of Italy, where Dante of Majano, originator (?) of the sonnet, headed the school of Sicilian imitators. Here, too, under the hands of early Tuscan or Bolognese poets (Folgore da San Gimignano, Rustico di Filippo, Guittone d' Arezzo, — his later poems, — Guido Guinizelli, etc.) the lyric began to lose something of its courtly troubadour qualities, and to take on a wider scope and significance as the expression of republican institutions. Moreover in the last quarter of the century, the poetic conception of love changed from that of the highly conventional Provençal code to a philosophical and mystical view of the spiritual significance of the emotion: "the noble heart cannot but love, and love inflames and purifies its nobility, as the power of the Deity is transmitted to the heavenly beings." With such high sentiment, the origin of which should be studied, the Tuscan school of the *Dolce Stil Nuovo* (cf. Purgatorio, 24: 55–57) was inspired. By its sincerity of sentiment and naturalness of expression this school elevated the Italian lyric, producing for the first time in the history of Italian literature a poetry of true inspiration, of noble ideas clothed in approximately perfect form: see the poems of Lapo Gianni (still somewhat Sicilian), Cavalcanti, Cino da Pistoia, Dante (Vita Nuova), Dino Frescobaldi, etc. — The religious lyric of the century should also be considered: the popular lyrico-narrative poems of Giacomino of Verona and Bonvecino of Riva, as well as the Franciscan poetry attending the Franciscan revival, — especially the *laude* of Jacopone da Todi and the poetic compositions attributed to St. Francis himself. — For a relic of popular poetry see the Contrasto of Ciullo d' Alcamo (or Cielo d' Alcamo, or dal Camo, or dal Carno), — a dispute between a man and a woman, belonging to the time of Frederick II. This poem is by its originality, vigor, and occasional coarseness not only characteristically 'popular,' but the very opposite of the conventional Sicilian lyric.

References. On *Provençal influence* see, as a brief introduction, Chap. IV of Grandgent's Dante (1916), Medieval Song; Chap. VII of Chaytor's The Troubadours; for extended treatment, La poésie française en Italie, in Jeanroy's Origines (*op. cit. supra*, § 5); Jeanroy, La poesia francese in Italia nel periodo delle origini (Firenze: 1897. In *Bibl. critica d. lett. ital.*, No. 18); C. de Lollis, Vita e poesia di Sordello (Halle: 1896); H. J. Chaytor, The Troubadours of Dante (Oxford: 1902); G. Bertoni, I trovatori minori di Genova (Dresden: 1903, cf. *Giorn. stor.*, 47: 331–348); E. Levi, Cantilene e ballate dei sec. 13 e 14, etc. (Torino: 1913; *Romania* 43: 271); A. Thomas, Francesco da Barberino et la litt. provençale en Italie au moyen âge (Paris: 1883); O. Schultz, Die Lebensverhältnisse der italienischen Trobadors (Berlin: 1883); Torraca, Federico II. e la poesia provenzale (in *Nuova antologia*, May 15, 1895), and Studi su la lirica ital. del duecento (Bologna: 1902; cf. *Giorn. stor.*, 42: 161 ff.); Zingarelli, Intorno a due trovatori in Italia (Firenze: 1899). — The history of the *Sicilian lyric* has received much attention. See F. Flamini, La lirica toscana del rinascimento anteriore ai tempi del Magnifico (Pisa: 1891), — with exhaustive bibliography, pp. 618–672; Bertoni (cited above); G. A. Cesareo, La poesia siciliana sotto gli Svevi (Catania: 1894), and Le orig. d. lirica, cited above; S. Friedmann, Die sizilianische Dichterschule (1878; translated into Italian, La scuola poetica siciliana del secolo XIII, by A. Gaspary. Livorno: 1882); O. de Hassek, La lirica italiana nel XIII secolo (Trieste: 1875); E. Monaci, Per la storia della scuola poetica siciliana, I–V (*Rendiconti della R. Accad. dei Lincei*, V, 2, 6. Rome: 1896); F. Scandone, Appunti biografici su due rimatori della scuola siciliana, etc. (Napoli: 1897); by the same, Ricerche novissime sulla scuola siciliana (Ferrara: 1900); A. Zenatti, La scuola poetica siciliana del secolo XIII (Messina: 1894), and Arrigo Testa e i primordi della lirica ital. (which is No. 4 in the series of monographs, *Biblioteca crit. della lett. ital.*, edited by F. Torraca). Much information is contained in E. F. Langley's critical edition of the poems of Giacomo da Lentino (Harvard Univ. Press). — On Guitone d' Arezzo, see the works, ed. F. Pellegrini (Bologna: 1901; cf. *Giorn. stor.*, 41: 354–64), and A. Pellizzari's La vita e le operi di G. d' A. (Pisa: 1906; cf. *Giorn. stor.*, 53: 346). On Guinizelli, see G. Salvadori in *Rassegna nazion.*, 1892; A. Bongioanni, Guido Guinizelli e la sua riforma poetica (in *Giornale dantesco*, 1896); his poems are in T. Casini's Rime dei poeti bolognesi del sec. XIII (Bologna: 1881).

The origin of the *sonnet* has been attributed to Provençal poets, to Pier delle Vigne (see Symonds, Ital. Lit.), to the notary, Giacomo da Lentini (Grandgent, Dante, pp. 131–2), to Fra Guittone (see S. Waddington), and to Dante of Majano. See L. Biadene, Morfologia del sonetto ital. (in Monaci's *Studi di filol. romanza*, vol. IV); R. Bunge, Zur Gesch. des italienischen Sonetts (in *Magazin f. d. Litt. d. In- und Auslandes*, 1884: 537, 554, 566, 582); and other references noted in Vollmöller's *Jahresbericht*, IV, ii, 242–243. For a strange use of the sonnet, see F. Castets, "Il Fiore," poème italien du XIII^{e} siècle, en 232 sonnets, imité du "Roman de la Rose" (Montpellier: 1881): cf. E. Pèrcopo, Il Fiore è di Rustico di Filippo? (in *Rassegna critica della lett. italiana*, 12: 49–59, with further bibliog. p. 51, note 2).

To *Dante's lyrical poetry* in the Vita Nuova and the Canzoniere a summary but excellent introduction is furnished by E. G. Gardner's Dante (The Temple Primers, Lond.: 1900); a more comprehensive criticism will be found in F. J. Snell's Handbook to Dante's Works (Lond.: 1909). In Gardner, a Bibliographical Appendix lists the more important editions and English translations, and some useful critical treatises. The student will find Kannegiesser and Witte, Dante Alighieri's lyrische Gedichte (2 vols. Leipz.: 1842) and Carducci's article on the Canzoniere (in Studi Letterari) of particular service. E. G. Gardner's Dante's Lyrical Poetry is announced as in preparation. On Dante's relation to the Minnesingers see F. Sander, Dante als Minnesänger (in *Archiv f. Littgesch.*, 6: 449. 1877), and later monographs. — On other poets of the *School of the Dolce Stil Nuovo*, see: I. M. Angeloni, Dino Frescobaldi e le sue rime (Torino: 1907): cf. E. Rivalta, Liriche del "dolce stil novo" (Venezia: 1906), pp. 63–91, — a most convenient collection in one volume of the poetry of the 'dolce stil'; L. Azzolina, Il dolce stil novo (Palermo: 1903); G. Bertoni, Il dolce stil nuovo (in *Studi medievali* 2: 352. 1906–07); E. Bindi and P. Fanfani, Le rime di Messer Cino da Pistoia (Pistoia: 1878); V. Cian, I contatti letter. italo-provenzali e la prima rivoluz. poetica d. lett. ital. (Messina: 1900); C. de Lollis, Dolce stil nuovo, etc. (in *Studi medievali*, 1: 5. 1904–05); P. Ercole, G. Cavalcanti e le sue rime (Livorno: 1885); F. Flamini, Dante e lo stil nuovo (in *Rivista d'Italia*, June 15, 1900); G. Lega, Il così detto "Trattato della Maniera di Servire" (in *Giorn. stor.*, vol. 48), with which cf. G. Bertoni, Una raccolta di sonetti del secolo XIII (in *Fanfulla della domenica*, XXX, 1); G. Salvadori, Il problema storico dello stil nuovo (in *Nuova antologia*, Series IV, vol. LXV, 1896), and La poesia giovanile e la canz. d'amore di G. Cavalcanti (Roma: 1895); P. Savi-Lopez, Il dolce stil nuovo, in his Trovatori e poeti (Palermo: 1906); K. Vossler, Die philosophischen Grundlagen zum süssen neuen Stil des Guido Guinicelli, Guido Cavalcanti, und Dante Alighieri (Heidelberg: 1904), — an attempt to connect the *dolce stil nuovo* of the Italian lyric with contemporary philosophy. With this last compare J. A. Symonds on the idea of love in Plato's Dialogues and in Dante's Vita Nuova, lyrics, and Divina Commedia (in *Cont. Rev.*, Sept. 1890).

The most illuminating work upon the *religious lyric* is Frédéric Ozanam's famous essay, now translated into English (The Franciscan Poets in Italy of the 13th Century. Scribner's), concerning which the following may be quoted from the introduction to the English translation: "No other book reproduces so sincerely and truly the spirit of the Franciscan movement, with all the glow of its religious ecstasy and all the charm of its innocent simplicity; no other book expounds so clearly the gradual evolution of that spirit, or testifies so convincingly to its influence on all aspects of human life and art. He shows it to us as a stream issuing from the bed-rock of religion, in the sacred art of the primitive Christian Church, and flowing on in a steadily widening channel through the earliest beginnings of that literature which was to have a universal appeal and gain a lasting hold on the mind of the poor and unlettered, no less than on that of the rich and cultured." See also A. d'Ancona, Jacopone da Todi (in the author's Studi sulla letteratura italiana dei primi secoli, 1884); G. Chiarini, La lirica religiosa nell' Umbria: Francesco d'Assisi e Jacopone da Todi (Ascoli: 1888); A. Tenneroni, Inizii di antiche poesie italiane religiose e morali con prospetto dei condici che le contengono e introduzione alle laudi spirituali (Firenze: 1909), — cf. A. Feist, Mitteilungen aus älteren Sammlungen italienischer geistlicher Lieder (in *Zeitschr. f. roman. Phil.*, 13: 115 ff. 1889). Further references in Flamini, pp. 335–336, and Bertoni (Duecento), pp. 275–277. — For the *humorous lyric*, see A. F. Massèra, Cecco Angioleri, I sonetti, etc. (Bologna: 1906), — cf. A. Momigliano, L'anima e l'arte di C. Angioleri (in *Italia Moderna*, 4: 678–684). — On *popular poetry*, see the references given above, under A. On Ciullo d'Alcamo much has been written: see D'Ancona, Studi sulla lett. ital. dei primi secoli (Ancona: 1884), p. 241 ff.

Editions and Translations. For a list of anthologies covering the earlier centuries, see above, the first paragraph under this division (VIII); for the popular lyric see Carducci's Intorno ad alcune rime dei secoli XIII e XIV, etc. (in Opere, 18: 107–282), and his Cantilene e ballate, strambotti e madrigali dei secoli XIII e XIV (Pisa: 1871). Of standard editions of Dante the following may be mentioned: E. Moore, Tutte le Opere (The Oxford Dante, 1894 and 1897); Fraticelli, the Opere Minori (vol. I, Canzonieri and Eclogues; vol. II, Vita Nuova); G. B. Giuliani, Vita Nuova and Canzonieri; of English translations, the Vita Nuova by D. G. Rossetti (in Dante and his Circle; and reprinted, Portland, Maine: 1896), and by C. E. Norton (Lond.: 1893); of the Canzonieri, by C. Lyell (Dante's Lyrical Poems, London: 1845), and by Plumptre (Commedia and Canzoniere, vol. II, Lond.: 1892). Further references to texts of Dante and other poets of the period may be found in Flamini and Bertoni. — The most famous English translations of the lyrics of this age are by Dante Gabriel Rossetti, — The Early Italian Poets (1st ed. 1861; see Temple Classics).

D. *The Fourteenth Century.*

Volpi's Trecento, in the Storia letteraria d' Italia series, is the best introduction to this period.

The study of the Renaissance lyric will naturally begin with an examination of the genius, literary derivations, and inventions of Petrarch, — "the first lyric poet of the modern school" and the master-lyrist of his time. His influence upon the development of the type is paramount for three centuries not only in Italy but in France, England, and other European countries. Professor Oelsner has indicated the modernity of Petrarch's realistic, personal lyrics, and their contrast with the conventional troubadour love-poems and the metaphorical, transcendental lyrics of Dante's circle, as follows:

> The one and only subject of these poems is love; but the treatment is full of variety in conception, in imagery and in sentiment, derived from the most varied impressions of nature. Petrarch's love is real and deep, and to this is due the merit of his lyric verse, which is quite different, not only from that of the Provençal troubadours and of the Italian poets before him, but also from the lyrics of Dante. Petrarch is a psychological poet, who dives down into his own soul, examines all his feelings, and knows how to render them with an art of exquisite

sweetness. The lyrics of Petrarch are no longer transcendental like Dante's, but on the contrary keep entirely within human limits. In struggles, in doubts, in fears, in disappointments, in griefs, in joys, in fact in everything, the poet finds material for his poetry (Art., Italian Lit., Encyc. Brit., 11th ed.).

Are these traits original with Petrarch, furnishing an example of that originative variation in literary development that is due to the mystery of genius? Did Petrarch in giving expression to these qualities become the mouthpiece of his age? Can careful examination show a closer union with his forerunners than is suggested by Professor Oelsner? Note also Petrarch's devotion to the file, by which he anticipates the stylistic formalism of the next century, and the interesting fact that in the technique of verse he is by no means an innovator. He was a pioneer, however, in the use of the madrigal. — Some of the minor poets worthy of attention are Fazio degli Uberti, Burchiello, Giovanni Fiorentino, Franco Sacchetti, and others as in references below. The *Dolce Stil Nuovo* was continued by Sennucio Del Bene, Graziolo de' Bambagliuoli, Bindo Bonichi, and Matteo Frescobaldi; the popular lyric by Antonio Pucci; the *laude* by Bianco da Siena and many others.

Editions and References. For references on *Petrarch*, see Ferrazi's Bibliografia petrarchesca (Bassano: 1877), continued by E. Calvi, Bibliografia analitica petrarchesca 1877–1904 (Roma: 1904); L. Suttina, Bibliografia delle opere a stampa intorno a Francesco Petrarca, etc. (Trieste: 1908); also, W. Fiske, A Catalogue of Petrarch Books (Ithaca, N.Y.: 1892). The authoritative edition of the poet's lyrics is that of G. Mestica, Rime di Petrarca (Firenze: 1896). Leopardi's commentary is the best thing of its kind. Of biographical and critical works the following may be mentioned as easily accessible and useful: G. Finzi, Petrarca (Firenze: 1900); Ugo Foscolo, Essays on Petrarch (Lond.: 1823); H. C. Hollway-Calthrop, Petrarch. His Life and Times (N.Y.: 1907); M. F. Jerrold, Francesco Petrarca (Lond.: 1909); G. Koerting, Petrarcas Leben und Werke (Leipz.: 1878); A. Mézières, Pétrarque (New ed. Paris: 1895); Pierre de Nolhac, Pétrarque et l'humanisme (New ed. 2 vols. Paris: 1907; adapted in English under the title Petrarch and the Ancient World. Boston: 1907), — a very valuable and readable book; C. M. Phillimore, Studies in Italian Literature

(Lond.: 1891); A. Piumati, La vita e le opere di F. Petrarca (Torino: 1885); J. H. Robinson and H. W. Rolfe, Petrarch, the First Modern Scholar and Man of Letters (N.Y.: 1898; 2d ed. 1914); De Sanctis, Petrarca e la critica francese (in *N. antol.*, IX, 1868); by the same, Saggio critico sul Petrarca (New ed. Napoli: 1907); P. Savj-Lopez, Ueber die provenzalischen Quellen der Lyrik Petrarcas (in *Beilage zur (Augsburger) Münchener Allgem. Zeitg.*, 283, 1901); N. Scarano, Fonti provenzali e italiani della lirica petrarchesca (in *Studi d. fil. romanza*, vol. VIII, pp. 250–360); C. Segrè, Studi petrarcheschi (Firenze: 1903); F. J. Snell, The Fourteenth Century (N.Y.: 1899), pp. 148–151, on Petrarch's indebtedness to his predecessors; C. Tomlinson (see above, § 2); G. Voigt, Die Wiederbelebung des classischen Alterthums (2d ed. 2 vols. Berlin: 1880–81: see Bk. 1); A. Zingerle, Petrarcas Verhältniss zu den römischen Dichtern (Progr. Innsbruck: 1870); I. Zocco, Petrarchisme e Petrarchisti in Inghilterra (Palermo: 1906); B. Zumbini, Studi sul Petrarca (Napoli: 1878), one of the best critical essays. Among the many histories of Italian literature, that by Garnett (Chap. VI) is especially commendable in its treatment of Petrarch. For a translation of some of the songs, see W. D. Foulke, Some Love Songs of Petrarch (Lond.: 1915).

The best aid to the study of the *minor poets* of the time is found in the histories of the literature of the period and in special articles in the periodicals. See G. Bertoni e E. P. Vicini, Poeti modenesi dei secoli XIV–XV (Modena: 1906); by the same, Sonetti di Pietro della Rocca e Francesco Vanozzo (Modena: 1907); F. Flamini, Gl' imitatori della lirica di Dante e del dolce stil nuovo (in the author's Studi di storia letteraria e straniera. Livorno: 1895); R. Fornaciari, on Sacchetti (in *Nuova antologia*, vol. XV), and on Pucci and popular poetry (in the same, Serie II, vol. I, 1876); E. Levi, F. Vanozzo e la lirica nelle corti lombarde durante la seconda metà del sec. XIV (Firenze: 1908); on this work, see R. Renier, Il Vanozzo (in *Fanfulla della domenica*, 30: 3), and E. Pèrcopo's review (in *Rassegna crit. della lett. ital.*, 16: 57–77); R. Renier, Liriche edite ed inedite di Fazio degli Uberti (Firenze: 1883; see the introduction); C. Segrè, Carmi latini inediti del secolo XIV intorno alla guerra di Ferrara del 1309 (in *Nuovo archivio veneto*, N. 70); G. Volpi, Rime di trecentisti minori (Firenze: 1907); C. E. Whitmore, Fazio degli Uberti as a Lyric Poet (in *Romanic Rev.* 5: 350. 1914).

On the *popular lyric*, see the reference under Fornaciari, above, and the references given above under A, The Beginnings. On *bucolic poetry*, see F. Macri-Leone, La bucolica latina nella letteratura italiana del secolo XIV (Torino: 1889).—Other refs. in Flamini's Compend., pp. 345–348.

E. *The Fifteenth Century.*

A convenient guide to the lyric of this century is furnished by V. Pitni-Piraino's La lirica italiana nel secolo XV (Palermo: 1886). See also F. Flamini, La lirica toscana del rinascimento anteriore ai tempi del Magnifico (Pisa: 1891), which contains a bibliographical appendix; P. Monnier, Le Quattrocento (Paris: 1891); V. Rossi, Il Quattrocento (Milano: 1897; contains bibliographical notes that should be consulted); and other histories mentioned in the appendix. Excellent material is contained in an anthology by Carducci (La poesia barbara nei secoli XV e XVI, Bologna: 1881); E. Costa's Antologia della lirica latina in Italia nei secoli XV e XVI (Città di Castello: 1888) has a valuable introduction.

The lyrists of the period lack the romantic fervor of Petrarch. Coleridge wrote of the Italian poets of this and the next century:

> They placed the essence of poetry in the art. The excellence at which they aimed consisted in the exquisite polish of the diction combined with the avoidance of every word which a gentleman would not use in dignified conversation, and of every word and phrase which none but a learned man could use.

Much attention was paid to elegance and finish of artistry by Politian and Lorenzo de' Medici. Both these poets turned the materials of nature, literary tradition, and popular poetry into lyric form. In the production of popular songs they were assisted and followed, during this century and the next, by Giuggiola, Ottonaio, Jacopo Nardi, Cardinal di Bibbiena, Machiavelli, Acciaiuoli, Antonio Alamanni, and others. These popular songs, or *Canti carnascialeschi*, represent a most interesting lyric development, analogues of which may be searched for in other literatures, both European and oriental. They are described as follows:

> These were a kind of choral songs, which were accompanied with symbolical masquerades, common in Florence at the carnival. They were written in a metre like that of the ballate; and for the most part they were put into the mouth of a party of workmen and tradesmen, who, with not very chaste allusions, sang the praises of their art. These triumphs and masquerades were directed by Lorenzo himself. At eventide there set out into the city large companies on horseback, playing and singing these songs.

In this century, too, belong the Rime of Boiardo, the Sonetti and Beca di Dicomano of Luigi Pulci (his Morgante, also, enshrines many a lyrical gem), and the later part of the work of Giusto de' Conti and Burchiello. — Religious poetry is represented by the Laude of Feo Belcari and the sacred poems of Savonarola and Benivieni. Much of lyrical worth may also be found in the miracle plays of the century, the *Rappresentazioni.*

Texts. Editions of the various authors can easily be found. A standard collection of *canzoni popolari* was Lasca's Raccolta di Trionfi . . . e Canti Carnascialeschi dal tempo di Lorenzo de' Medici (Firenze: 1559), — reissued with additions (Lucca: 1750). An evidently interesting volume of religious lyrics, Canzonette Spirituali, written to popular airs of the fourteenth century, is mentioned by Luigi Settembrini (Lezioni di letteratura italiana, 3 vols., Napoli: 1894, — vol. I, pp. 301–305). Most of these Laudi Spirituali are by Feo Belcari. To them are appended poems in *ottava rima* upon the Passion, Resurrection, etc., by Bernardo Pulci and others. Some of the *Rappresentazioni* were published as Rime Sacre del Magnifico Lorenzo de' Medici il vecchio . . . e d' altri della stessa famiglia, . . . corredate per Francesco Cionacci (2d ed. Bergamo: 1760). Others entitled Rappresentazioni di Feo Belcari were published in Florence, 1833.

References. References may be found in Rossi. To those in Flamini's Compendio, pp. 348–353, the following may be added: A. Belloni, Un lirico (G. F. Suardi) del quattrocento a torto inedito e dimenticato (in *Giorn. storico della lett. ital.*, vol. 51); N. Campanini (Ed.), Studi su M. M. Boiardo (Bologna: 1894), which contains an essay on Boiardo's lyrics; A. Cinquini, Rime edite ed inedite di ser Benedetto de' Biffoli rimatore del secolo XV (in *Bullettino storico pistoiese*, X); G. Fabris, Sonetti villaneschi di Giorgio Sommariva poeta veronese del secolo XV (Udine: 1907); L. Frati, Rimatori bolognesi del quattrocento (Bologna: 1908).

F. *The Sixteenth Century.*

F. Flamini's Il Cinquecento is indispensable; its bibliographical notes furnish the student with copious apparatus. Further helps are: M. Piéri, Le Pétrarquisme au XVI^e^ siècle (Marseilles: 1895); L. Carrer, I Petrarchisti, in the 2d vol. of the author's Prose (Firenze: 1855); E. Levi, Lirica italiana nel cinquecento e del seicento fino all' Arcadia (Firenze: 1908): compare A. Fantozzi, Lirica italiana del cinquecento e nel seicento (in *Fanfulla della domenica*, 31 : 3); G. Mazzoni, La lirica nel cinquecento (in the author's Glorie e memorie dell' arte, etc. Firenze: 1905). For a small but convenient anthology, see Lirici del secolo XVI (Milano: 1879). Carducci's anthology has already been mentioned above, under E.

This is the age of the Petrarchan Revival. The lyrists, good and bad, took the master of the fourteenth century as their model. With one or two exceptions their array of sonnets and *canzoni* lacks passion and inspiration; the execution is frequently graceful but with the grace of frigidity. The exceptions are to be found in a few of Michelangelo's sonnets, those dealing with ideal beauty and with the love of Florence; in the sonnets, especially those that sing his patriotism, of Giovanni Guidiccioni; and in the spontaneous and pathetic verses which record the hopeless love of Gaspara Stampa. Among the other writers of this school may be mentioned Bembo, Caro, Giovanni della Casa, Vittoria Colonna, Angelo di Costanzo, Francesco Molza, and Tansillo. The lyrical compositions of Ariosto, also, though not of high merit call for attention, and those of Bernardo Tasso. Of more especial importance are the lyrical quality of Torquato Tasso's pastoral drama, Aminta, of his heroic romance, the Gerusalemme Liberata, his odes, and his "Coronal" of sonnets,—and the lyrical art and spirit of Guarini's Pastor Fido.

References. General introductions and aid of a more particular nature will be found in the following: D. Alaleona, Le laudi spirituali italiane nei secoli XVI e XVII e il loro rapporto coi canti profani (in *Rivista musicale italiana*, 16: 1); A. Borzelli, Una poetessa italiana del secolo XVI, Gaspara Stampa, 1523–53 (Napoli: 1888); N. de Sanctis, La lirica amorosa di Michelangelo Buonarroti (Palermo: 1898); L. Ferrai, L. de' Medici e la società cortigiana del cinquecento, etc. (Milano: 1891); S. Ferrari, Di alcune imitazioni delle Anacreontiche in Italia nel sec. XVI (in *Giorn. ligust.* 20, 1890); F. Fiorentino, Poesie liriche . . . di L. Tansillo, etc. (Napoli: 1882); F. Flamini, Per la storia della lirica ital. dal Poliziano al Bembo, in the author's Spigolature di erudizione e di critica; by the same, Sulle poesie del Tansillo, etc. (Pisa: 1888), L'egloga e i poemetti di Luigi Tansillo (Napoli: 1893), and Studi di storia letteraria italiana e straniera (Livorno: 1895); D. Gnoli, Vecchie odi barbare e traduzioni di Orazio (in *N. antol.*, Dec. 15, 1878);

A. Graf, Attraverso il Cinquecento (Torino: 1888); V. Laurenza, Il canzonieri di L. Tansillo (Malta: 1908); R. Mazzone, Vittoria Colonna . . . e il suo canzoniere (Marsala: 1897); A. Morpurgo, Vittoria Colonna (Trieste: 1888); E. Pèrcopo, Madrigalisti napoletani anteriori al MDXXXVI (Napoli: 1887); by the same, Rime inedite di Matteo Bandello (in *Rassegna critica della lett. italiana*, 13: 49–60); F. Pintor, Delle liriche di T. Tasso (Pisa: 1899); M. Rossi, Saggio sui tratti d' amore del Cinquecento (1889); O. Ferrini, Saggio sulle rime amorose di T. Tasso (Perugia: 1886); A. Solerti, Le liriche amorose di T. Tasso (in *Nuova antol.*, S. III, vol. 40); A. Sorrentino, Della lirica encomiastica di T. Tasso (Salerno: 1910); H. Vaganay, Le sonnet en Italie et en France au XVI^{e} siècle (Lyons: 1902), — a bibliographical account of the collections of Italian and French sonnets of the sixteenth century; and, in general, monographs on the authors mentioned above. Further references, including texts, in Flamini's Compendio, pp. 356–366.

G. *The Seventeenth Century.*

Chapters I, II, and XII of A. Belloni's Il Seicento deal with the lyric and with the exaggerated mannerisms ("Secentismo") of the time. The corresponding sections of the bibliographical appendix are most helpful. See also Morsolin's Il Seicento (Milano: 1880), B. Croce's Saggi sulla lett. italiana del Seicento (Bari: 1911), and vols. XII and XIV of F. Salfi's Histoire littéraire d'Italie (Paris: 1824–35), the continuation of Ginguené. Other references in the Appendix. — For a small but convenient anthology, see Lirici del secolo XVII (Milano: 1878). B. Croce's Lirici marinisti (Bari: 1910: in the Scrittori d' Italia series) should also be mentioned.

A period of blight and depression, due largely to civil (Spanish) and ecclesiastical tyranny. The far-fetched, antithetic, extravagant ('euphuistic') style of Marino (or Marini) — his Adone and sonnets — induced in a crowd of poetasters a false poetic taste which influenced Italian poetry for many a decade, in fact more or less infected the century. Among his immediate followers were Achillini and Preti. Marinism was combatted by Chiabrera, who, while still seeking novelty, took for his masters in style Pindar and Anacreon, and aimed to revolutionize poetic diction, rhythm, and structure by reproducing in the ode the grand manner of the former and in *canzonette* the airy elegance of the latter. Occasionally achieving lyrical nobility, most of his song is pompous, complicated, and artificial. In Testi the influence both of Marino and Chiabrera is manifest. Though his lyrics are dignified, thoughtful, and sometimes pretty, the tone in general is one of affectation. Redi and Filicaia follow: the former in his Bacchus in Tuscany, more natural, replete with pleasantry, bold in imagery and flights of fancy, varied in metrical performance, and regardful of common sense; the latter attaining sometimes to splendor in odes and sonnets of patriotism and religion, but unable to shake off the shackles of the unnatural style. The purely lyrical poems of Guidi di Pavia, born in the middle of the century, are marked by the Pindaric ostentation of Chiabrera. In his pastoral dramas, however, Guidi is the forerunner of a new school, and with Gravina and Crescimbeni was one of the founders of the Academy, called the Arcadia. This association, formed in 1690, aimed to reform Italian poetry by substituting for the antithetic extravagance and false conceits of Marinism, and the turgidities of Pindaric imitators, the truth and simple diction of pastoral life. Independently of the Arcadia, Maggi, who died in 1699, and Lemène (d. 1704) had for years been working toward a similar affectation of naïveté. The Arcadian school dominates the earlier part of the next century.

Genuine relief from the obtaining artificiality of poetic composition may be found in the Poesie filosofiche of Campanella and the satires of Salvator Rosa: in the thought, passion, and economy of phrase of the former; in the bursts of lyric indignation, moral fervor, and spontaneous patriotism of the latter.

References. A. Aldini, La lirica nel Chiabrera (Livorno: 1887), — cf. G. A. Venturi in *Giornale storico*, 11: 432–442; A. Belloni, Vita e letteratura nell' Italia del Seicento (Napoli: 1906); A. Borzelli, Il cavalier Giambattista Marino (Napoli: 1898); E. Canevari, Lo stile del Marino (Paris: 1901); V. Caravelli, Pirro Schettini e l' antimarinismo (in *Atti dell' Acad. di archeol.*, Napoli, 14: 111 ff.); G. Carducci, Dello svolgimento dell' ode in Italia (in Opere, 16: 361–442); Corradino, Il secentismo e l' Adone (Torino: 1880); G. F. Damiani, Sopra la poesia del cav. Marino (Torino: 1899); S. Ferrari, Di alcune imitazioni e rifioriture delle "anacreontee" in Italia nel secolo XVI (in *Giornale* *storico*, 20: 395–424); A. Graf, Il fenomeno del secentismo (in *Nuova antol.*, Oct. 1, 1905); G. Imbert, Il Bacco in Toscana di Fr. Redi (Città di Castello: 1890; cf. Imbert's article on Redi in *Nuova antol.*, Oct. 15, 1895); G. Magrini, Studio su B. Menzini (Napoli: 1885); by the same, La vita italiana nel Seicento (Milano: 1885); F. Mango, Il Marino poeta lirico (Cagliari: 1887); by the same, Le fonti dell' Adone (Torino: 1891), Della fama di G. B. Marino (Genova: 1898); M. Menghini, La vita e le opere di Giambattista Marino (Roma: 1888); by the same, T. Stigliani (in *Giorn. ligustico*, XVII, fasc. 7, 8); F. d' Ovidio, Secentismo, spagnolismo (in *Nuova antol.*, Oct. 15, 1892); A. Pagano, Un poeta lirico (G. G. Lavagna) del Seicento (Napoli: 1907); F. Picco, Salotti francesi e poesia ital. nel Seicento (Torino: 1905); Studies in European Literature (being the Taylorian Lectures, Oxford: 1889–1899), for sources and interrelations in general. For further references, including *Editions* of the various authors, see Belloni as cited at the head of this century, and Flamini's Compendio, pp. 366–367.

H. *The Eighteenth Century.*

On the century in general see Tullo Concari's Il Settecento (Milano: 1899), Chap. VIII of which is concerned with the lyric, Chap. I with the Arcadian Academy, Chap. VI with humorous and didactic verse; the corresponding sections of the bibliographical appendix furnish extensive aid. M. Landau's Gesch. der ital. Litt. im 18ten Jahrhundert (Berlin: 1899) is a large and valuable work. In Chap. I of G. Mazzoni's L'Ottocento (cited under the next century) is a good résumé of the literature of the second half of the 18th century, which shows how the lyric was renovated by Parini, narrative verse by Cesarotti, and tragedy by Alfieri. A. Lombardi's Storia della lett. ital. nel secolo XVIII (Milano: 1827–30) is helpful though old. Other general works are G. Mazzoni's La vita ital. nel Settecento (Milano: 1903); G. Guerzoni's Il terzo rinascimento (Verona: 1888); and G. Maugain's Étude sur l'évolution intellectuelle de l'Italie de 1657 à 1750 (Paris: 1910). The great Italian poet and critic, Carducci, has several essays dealing with the lyric of the period: see his Della poesia melica italiana e di alcuni poeti erotici del secolo XVIII, being the preface to a collection of Poeti erotici del secolo XVIII (Firenze: 1868); also, the preface to his Lirici del secolo XVIII (Firenze: 1871), — dealing with the classical lyric of the second half of the century (see vol. XIX of the author's Opere. 20 vols. Bologna: 1889–1909). Cf. G. Rossi, Melica e lirica del Settecento (in *Fanfulla della domenica*, 31: 3). A helpful work is

V. A. Arullani's Lirica e lirici nel settecento (Torino-Palermo: 1893). — On the Arcadians, see Vernon Lee's Studies of the Eighteenth Century in Italy (1880); I. Carini, L' Arcadia dal 1690 al 1890 (Roma: 1891); and Crescimbeni's two works, — the Vite degl' Arcadi Illustri (4 vols. Roma: 1708–27), and L' Arcadia (1711).

First to be noticed and forced upon one's notice is the lyric deluge poured forth by the Arcadians. The attempt to sing of, and with, the simplicity of shepherds resulted in a myriad novel forms of literary artifice and sentimentality. The conception — as shown in the Jesus Puer, a Latin poem by Thomas Ceva, 1690, and in the organization of the Academy, based upon the Instructions of Loyola — was essentially Jesuitical. Humanity is reduced to one type, the sham pastoral and childlike: the child Jesus is Patron of the school; Crescimbeni, the literary historian, is its President. Poetry becomes the art of versifying with an eye to pleasure alone: it is reduced to a purely mechanical affair in which matter and thought are negligible or trivial. Love is a simulacrum of ideal beauty, and imagination is regulated by rules as foolish as severe. The product is a *mélange* of emasculated sonnets, heroic, sacred, natal, nuptial, monastic, mortuary, intellectually amative; odes, *canzonette*, metrical tales and toys. Among the perpetrators of this stuff, besides Lemène and Maggi, are Frugoni, Casti, Perfetti, and the two Zappis. The most harmonious, fresh, and sometimes natural, of Arcadians before Metastasio was probably Paolo Rolli.

The reaction against the Arcadia may be traced first within the movement itself, as in the verses of Manfredi, which evince nobility, beauty, and thought; in the Ricciardetto of Carteromaco (Forteguerri), — a humorous poem, but replete with novel imagery, delicious fancy, and lyric spontaneity; in the Visions of Alfonso Varano, which though arid in style aim to revive the biblical and Dantesque in poetry; in the poets of the last Arcadian manner, — Bertòla, under the German influence, Savioli and Vittorelli, under that of Anacreon, Horace, and Ovid. The reaction gathers full force in Giuseppe Parini (1729–1799), who, beginning with the frigidities and puerilities of the Arcadia, turns about the middle of the century to the realities of life; and in his odes and a satiric poem, 1763, Il Giorno (lyrical as well as satiric), shakes himself almost free of the vapidities and metrical monotonies of the Arcadian school. He established the new lyric, social and moral, richer in thought than in imagination, — in form reviving what was sane of the classical tradition of Chiabrera, and aiming to reproduce the harmonies and rhythms of the Horatian ode. For him profit is inseparable from poetic pleasure. He is the first great poet of modern Italy.

The reform was aided, meanwhile, by writers of criticism. In his journal, Frusta Letteraria (Ed., A. Serena, Milano: 1897), Baretti lashed the Arcadians mercilessly. And Gozzi continued the process in satiric prose as well as verse, and in his judicial Defense of Dante (Ed., A. Serena, Verona: 1895), leveled at the silly Virgilian Letters of Bettinelli. Among the forces making for a new period of Italian literary taste, his attack upon the Jesuitical movement in poetry is of prime importance.

In the lyric drama of the century, Apostolo Zeno and Metastasio "endeavored to make melodrama and reason compatible." In the operas and oratorios of the former (1668–1750), love and, consequently, the lyrical episodes are supreme; but the poetry lacks inspiration and rhythmic melody. The poetry of Metastasio (1698–1782), on the other hand, is of genuine lyric genius. He commenced Arcadian, but after the death of his patron, Gravina, in 1718, the spirit of his verse changes: his odes leap with patriotism and passion; and the lyrics imbedded in his long series of operas from 1721 on, though still ideal, aloof from actual existence, idyllic and Arcadian, are full of pleasing pathos and sentiment, and novel with voluptuous beauty and musical cadence. He is the most charming, popular, and representative lyrist of this period.

In tragedy, the greatest writer that Italy has had is also of this century. Alfieri (1749–1803) by his odes and sonnets no less than by his dramas, throbbing with enthusiastic patriotism, did for the poetry of the political revival what Parini performed for that of the moral. Also, like Parini, he is the proponent of the ancient classical tradition in method and form. This tradition was continued by Monti (1754–1828), many of whose panegyrics and odes were written before the close of the century, and by Foscolo, who between 1797 and 1800 was just beginning his career in tragedy, lyric, and romance.

At the head of the Sicilian poets of the century stands Giovanni Meli, with melodious lyrics in the native dialect but of Arcadian manner.

References. G. Agnelli, Precursori e imitatori del Giorno di G. Parini (Bologna: 1888); G. Baccini, G. B. Fagiuoli poeta faceto fiorentino (Firenze: 1886); E. Bertana, Studi pariniani: la materia e il fine del Giorno (Spezia: 1893, and *Giorn. storico*, 27: 334); by the same, Il Parini tra i poeti giocosi del Settecento (in Supplem. No. 1 to *Giorn. storico*), V. Alfieri studiato nella vita, nel pensiero e nell' arte (2d ed., Torino: 1904), Intorno al Frugoni (in *Giorn. storico*, 12: 354); V. Bortolotti, G. Parini, vita, opere, e tempi (Milano: 1900); E. Bouvy, Voltaire et l'Italie (Paris: 1898); G. Bustico, Bibliografica di V. Alfieri (Salò: 1907; see also *Giorn. stor.*, 15: 89–123, 50: 225–226); A. Butti, Studi pariniani (Torino: 1895); G. Carducci, Saggio di bibliografia pariniana (in Opere, 13: 349), and other essays on Parini, included in the Opere; V. Cian, L' immigraz. dei gesuiti spagnuoli letterati in Italia (Torino: 1895); L. Collison-Morley, G. Baretti (Lond.: 1909); F. Flamini, A. Bertòla e i suoi studi intorno alla lett. tedesca (Roma: 1895); A. Graf, L' anglomania e l' influsso inglese in Italia nel sec. XVIII (Torino: 1911); E. Levi-Malvano, L' elegia amorosa nel Settecento (Torino: 1908), mostly concerned with Lodovico Savioli; A. Malmignati, G. Gozzi e i suoi tempi (Padova: 1890); G. Muoni, Poesia notturna preromantica (Milano: 1908); G. Natali, La mente e l' anima di G. Parini (Modena: 1900); L. Piccioni, Studi e ricerche intorno a G. Baretti (Livorno: 1899); A. Simoni, J. Vittorelli, La vita e gli scritti (1907); G. Zanella, I costumi del sec. XVIII e la poesia del Parini, as extracted from Zanella's Della lett. ital. nell' ultimo secolo by Morandi, Antologia della nostra critica lett. moderna, pp. 571–578. See also on Lemène, C. Vignati (in *Arch. stor. lombardo*, 20: 352); on Maratti, L. Morandi (in *Nuova antol.*, Feb. 16, 1888); on Rolli, Carducci's preface to his Poeti erotici del sec. XVIII; on Frugoni, E. Bertana in In Arcadia (Napoli: 1909), and G. Mazzoni, In biblioteca (2d ed. Bologna: 1886). Further references and *Editions* in Flamini's Compendio, pp. 370–378, and in Concari as cited at the head of this century.

I. *The Nineteenth Century.*

Guido Mazzoni's L' Ottocento, in the Storia letteraria d' Italia, is the chief authority (see especially Chaps. V, VI, VII, IX) and is well arranged to show the development of types; it contains extensive critical apparatus. G. Zanella's Storia della lett. ital. dalla metà del Settecento ai giorni nostri (Milano: 1880) and F. de Sanctis' La lett. ital. nel secolo XIX (Napoli: 1897) are helpful. J. C. Hobhouse and E. Levati have published sketches of the literature of the first quarter of the century (see Appendix). See also G. Mestica, Manuale della lett. ital. nel secolo XIX (Firenze: 1882–87). The English student will derive most help from L. Collison-Morley's Modern Italian Lit. (Lond.: 1911). See also W. D. Howells, Modern Italian Poets (in *N. Am. Rev.*; reprinted, N.Y.: 1887); the introduction to F. Sewall's translations from Carducci (1892); G. A. Greene, Italian Lyrists of To-Day (1893); M. Muret, La litt. ital. d'aujourd'hui (Paris: 1906); A. Roux, La litt. contemp. en Italie, 1873–96 (2 vols. Paris: 1883–96); also articles in *Nuova antologia* and *Deutsche Rundschau.* Some of the best articles on contemporary literature are B. Croce's in *La critica.*

In the second half of the 18th century classicism, romanticism, naturalism, and sentimentalism were apparent. Classicism was represented in Italy by Monti and Foscolo (1778–1827), who bring us well into the 19th century. Other lyrists of the neo-classic tradition were Arici, Benedetti, Biondi, Cassi, Costa, Maffei, Mamiani, Marchetti, Niccolini, Nobile, Perticari, Strocchi. At the head of the romantic revolt was Alessandro Manzoni (1785–1873) with his religious and patriotic lyrics; also of the same school were Berchet, Biava, Carrer, Carlo Porta, Grossi, Niccolini (first a classicist), Torti, etc. — The patriotic poets of the Risorgimento deserve attention: Berchet, Giannone, Brofferio, Giusti, Mameli, Mercantini, Poerio, Prati, Gabriele Rossetti, Parzanese, etc. Giusti's satirical lyrics and Belli's sonnets on the life and manners of Rome should also be noted. — But the most important figure of the first half of the century, and the chief glory of all Italian lyric poetry, as well as one of Europe's greatest lyrists, was Giacomo Leopardi (1798–1837), whose impeccable verse shows strong classical influence, but also modern spirit.

In the middle of the century some rather faint romantic work was accomplished. See Aleardi, Carrer, Fr. dall' Ongaro, Prati, Rossetti, Tommasèo. With Zanella (1868) the tide sets again toward classicism. But the poet of note of the second half of the century, who overthrows the romantic school and returns fully to the classical, which is after all native to the Italian, is Giosuè Carducci (1835–1907). The poet of unified Italy and of the new kingdom, national to the core, he celebrates in his Rime nuove (1861–1887) the historic memories of his country with an elegance and severity purely Hellenic, and a personality of emotion vividly modern. In his Odi barbare, of the soil and real, neo-pagan and ideal, he victoriously adapts the metres of Horace and Catullus to the speech of modern Italy, abandoning laws of quantity and substituting rhythm by accent. He influences the lyric of to-day with a classicism which is not an imitation, but a fusion of ancient Italian spirit and form with living spontaneity, imagination, and natural expression. Among his followers are Chiarini, Gnoli, Marradi, Ferrari, Guido Mazzoni, and Pascoli. Opposed to the Bolognese school of Carducci are Cavallotti, who returned to the classical prosody, the Sicilians Cannizzaro, Rapisardi, and Cesareo. Among the independents must be mentioned Graf, Fogazzaro, Ada Negri, Panzacchi, Manni, Bacelli, Pastonchi, and Guerrini. The last mentioned, with his Postuma di Lorenzo Stecchetti (1877), introduced a realist school of poetry after the French fashion, especially that of Baudelaire. As a novelist and poet, passionately despised or admired, Gabriele D' Annunzio has for some years past been the acknowledged leader of a school of aesthetic carnality and dilettantism. Inspired in the first instance by the Odi barbare of Carducci, he speedily betrayed an innate preference (in the Canto nuovo, 1882) for the sensuality of Guerrini, and in his succeeding lyrics developed to the highest degree of finish the poetry of heartless eroticism, hedonistic realism, and elaborate beauty of form. A man of startling genius and resource, he has during the present war by speech and deed wiped out all condemnation of his aesthetic career, and stands the idol of his countrymen.

References. Italian criticism is rich in works on the literature of the nineteenth century. The following list is suggestive only. — On *Monti*, see C. Cantú, V. Monti e l' età che fu sua (Milano: 1879); P. Hazard, La révolution française et les lettres italiennes (Paris: 1910); B. Zumbini, Sulle poesie di V. Monti (Firenze: 1894); M. Kerbaker, Shakesp. e Goethe nei versi di V. M. (in the *Bibl. critica* of Torraca, No. 15); A. Scrocca, Studi sul Monti e sul Manzoni (Napoli: 1905). — On *Foscolo and the classical movement*: E. Donadoni, Ugo Foscolo pensatore, critico, poeta (Palermo: 1910); A. Graf, Foscolo, Manzoni, Leopardi (Torino: 1898); F. de Sanctis, Ugo Foscolo (in the author's Nuovi saggi critici, Napoli: 1879); F. G. de Winckels, Vita di Ugo Foscolo (Verona: 1858); G. Zanella, Gray e Foscolo (in *Nuova antol.*, XXV, 1881; also in the author's Paralleli letterari, Verona: 1885); B. Zumbini, Studi di letteratura italiana (Firenze: 1894). For further bibliography of Foscolo, see P. Gori in his Opere poet. del Foscolo (Firenze: 1886). — On *Manzoni*: as below, under the Romantic Movement, and the following: G. Barzellotti, Studi e ritratti (Bologna: 1893); G. Finzi, vol. IV of his Lezioni di storia della letteratura italiana (Torino: 1891); A. Graf, Foscolo, Manzoni, Leopardi (Torino: 1898); F. D' Ovidio, Nuovi studi manzoniani (Milano: 1908); P. Petrocchi, Dell' opera di A. M. (Milano: 1886); A. Piumati, La vita e le opere di A. M. (Torino: 1886); A. Vismara, Bibliografia manzoniana (Milano: 1875). For further references on Monti, Foscolo, and Manzoni, see Gröber's Grundriss 2: 3: 199 etc. (1896), Flamini's Compendio, pp. 378–383, and D' Ancona-Bacci, Manuale della lett. ital., vols. V, VI. — On the *Romantic Movement*: G. Berchet, Lettera semiseria di Grisostomo (Milano: 1816), — the program of the romantic (literary and political) movement in Italy; E. Bertana, Arcadia lugubre, in In Arcadia (Napoli: 1909); U. A. Canello, Saggi di critica letteraria (Bologna: 1877); C. Cantú, Il Conciliatore e i Carbonari (Milano: 1878); F. de Sanctis, La letteratura italiana nel secolo XIX (Napoli: 1902); U. Foscolo, Della nuova scuola romantica in Italia (1827; in vol. IV of the author's Opere, Firenze: 1850–62); R. Giovagnoli, Il romanticismo nella storia del risorgimento italiano (Roma: 1904); V. Imbriani, G. Berchet e il romanticismo ital. (in *Nuova antol.*, June, Aug., 1868); C. G. Londonio, Sulla poesia romantica, cenni critici (Milano: 1817); G. Mazzoni, Le origini del romanticismo (in *Nuova antol.*, 3 Serie, vol. 47); G. Muoni, Note per una poetica stor. del romanticismo (Milano: 1906); F. Orlandi, Dissertazione storio-critica sopra il romanticismo e il classicismo (Firenze: 1889); A. Pesenti, Il romanticismo in Italia (Milano: 1882); G. Piergili, Il foglio azzurro e i primi romantici (in *Nuova antol.*, 3 Serie, vol. 4);

L. Robecchi, Saggio d' una bibliografia sulla questione classico-romantica (Milano: 1887); G. Trezza, Classicismo e romanticismo, in his Studi critici (Verona: 1878); E. Visconti, Idee elementari sulla poesia romantica (in *Conciliatore*, Nos. 23–28, 1818); G. Zanella, Scuola romantica e scuola classica (in the author's Della letteratura italiana nell' ultimo secolo. Città di Castello: 1885). — On *Leopardi*: G. Carducci, Degli spiriti e delle forme nella poesia di Giacomo Leopardi; I. della Giovanna, La ragione poetica dei canti di G. Leopardi (Verona: 1892); F. de Sanctis, Studio su G. Leopardi (Napoli: 1894); A. Graf, Foscolo, Manzoni, Leopardi (Torino: 1898); G. Mestica, Studi leopardiani (Firenze: 1901); É. Rod, Études sur le XIX^{e} siècle (2d ed. Paris: 1894); B. Zumbini, Studi sul Leopardi (2 vols. Firenze: 1902–04); also, an article in the *Quart. Rev.*, 86: 311. Leopardi's works have been edited by Ranieri (Opere, 1846–80), and Cugnoni (Opere Inedite, 1878–80). *Victor Hugo's influence* on the Italian lyric has been studied by M. Valente (Victor Hugo e la lirica italiana. Torino: 1907). — On *Carducci*, see G. L. Bickersteth, Carducci: Select. of his Poems, with verse translations and three introductory essays; N. Busetto, L' anima e l' arte di G. Carducci (Treviso: 1907); G. Chiarini, G. C., impressioni e ricordi (Bologna: 1901), and Memorie della vita di G. C. (2d ed. Firenze: 1907); E. Cocchia, L' ideale . . . di G. Carducci (Napoli: 1907); F. D' Ovidio, La versificaz. delle Odi barbare di G. C., in Miscellanea in onore di A. Graf; D. Ferrari, Saggio d' interpretaz. d. Odi barbare (3 vols. Cremona: 1909–10); A. Jeanroy, G. C., l'homme et le poète (Paris: 1911); F. Torraca, G. Carducci (Napoli: 1907); F. Sewall, as mentioned above; and English magazine articles, to be traced through Poole's index. — On *D' Annunzio*, see G. A. Borgese, G. D' Annunzio (Napoli: 1909); V. Morello, G. D' A. (Roma: 1910); Croce's *La critica*, as cited above; English magazine articles. — For further references and *Editions*, see Flamini's Compendio, pp. 378–392. For *Anthologies*, see S. Ferrari, Antologia della lirica moderna italiana (Bologna: 1891; ed. riveduta, 1908); G. Puccianti, Antologia della poesia italiana moderna (Firenze: 1899); G. Rigutini, Crestomazia italiana della poesia moderna (Firenze: 1886); R. Fornaciari, Poesia italiana del secolo XIX (Firenze: 1888).

J. *Italian Popular Lyric.* Some works dealing with Italian popular verse have already been mentioned above (see A, The Beginnings). Especial account should be taken of the excellent works of Nigra and D' Ancona. Nigra (Canti popolari del Piemonte. Torino: 1888) has much of great value on the distribution of Italian popular literature; and D' Ancona (La poesia popolare italiana. 2d ed. Livorno: 1906) gives an admirable review of the general subject and contributes a very helpful bibliography, which the student should consult for references not listed here. Some representative works are those of G. Amalfi (collections of the popular lyrics of Sorrento, etc.); G. Bernoni (for the lyrics of Venetia); P. Caliari (for Verona); Dal Medico (for Venetia); S. Ferrari, Biblioteca di lett. popol. ital. (Firenze: 1882); G. Ferraro (for Ferrara, Cento, Basso Monferrato, etc.); G. Giannini (for Tuscany); Imbriani (Calabria, etc.); Molinaro Del Chiaro (Naples, etc.); Pitré (Sicily); Tigri (Tuscany); Tommasèo, Canti popolari toscani, corsi, illirici e greci (1841–42); Vigo (Sicily); etc. For works in English see F. Alexander (Roadside Songs of Tuscany. N.Y.: 1886); J. A. Symonds (Sketches and Studies in Southern Europe. 2 vols. N.Y.: 1880. See vol. I, Popular Italian Poetry of the Renaissance, Popular Songs of Tuscany; cf. Renaiss. in Italy, Ital. Lit., Pt. I, Chaps. IV, V); Countess Martinengo-Cesaresco, Essays in the Study of Folk-Songs (1886: Venetian, Sicilian).

IX. The Spanish Lyric.

The most complete history in English of Spanish literature is Ticknor's; the most complete in Spanish is D. Julio Cejador y Franca's Historia de la lengua y literatura castellana (6+ vols. Madrid: 1915+). The latest Spanish edition (Madrid: 1916) of Fitzmaurice-Kelly's history contains valuable bibliographical materials, supplementing the older materials noted by Ticknor. The proper articles in Gröber's Grundriss must not be neglected. Other histories are mentioned in the Appendix. Best of all for the student of the lyric is Menéndez y Pelayo's Antología de poetas líricos castellanos desde la formación del idioma hasta nuestros días (13 vols. Madrid: 1890–1908): the various prefaces give lists of collections of Spanish lyrics, and with profound knowledge treat many interesting questions regarding the origin and growth of the Spanish lyric. Bibliographical works are given by Fitzmaurice-Kelly, as noted above, and in the article Spanish Lit., Encyc. Brit., 11th ed. — Spain is rich in general collections of its literature. In the following the student will almost always be able to find the texts with which he wishes to work: Rivadeneyra's great Biblioteca de autores españoles (78 vols.

Madrid: 1842–80); Murillo's Colección de escritores castellanos (100+ vols. Madrid: 1880+); Brockhaus' Collection (48 vols. Leipz.: 1863–87); Menéndez y Pelayo's collection of lyric poetry, as mentioned above; J. M. Maury's Choix de poésies castellanes depuis Charles V. jusqu'à nos jours (2 vols. Paris: 1826); F. J. Wolf's Floresta de rimas modernas castellanas (2 vols. Paris: 1837); Quintana's Poesías selectas castellanas; and F. R. Marin's Cantos populares españoles, etc. (5 vols. Sevilla: 1882–83), with text and bibliography.—The Oxford Book of Spanish Verse (ed. J. Fitzmaurice-Kelly) gives an admirable selection of verse from the 13th century to the 20th. In Longfellow's Poets and Poetry of Europe will be found English translations of many Spanish lyrics,—an excellent introduction for the general student who does not read Spanish.

On *Catalan* literature, see A. Morel-Fatio's Katalanische Litt. in Gröber's Grundriss, and his articles in *Romania*; F. R. Camboulin, Essai sur l'hist. de la litt. catalane (Paris: 1858); E. Cardona, Dell' antica letteratura catalana (Napoli: 1878); V. M. O. Denk, Einführung in die Gesch. der altcat. Litt. (München: 1893); Milá y Fontanals, Estudios sobre historia, lengua y literatura de Cataluña (being vol. III of the Obras Completas, Barcelona: 1888–96).

On *Galician* literature, see in Gröber's Grundriss, M. de Vasconcellos, Gesch. der portugiesischen Lit. (Strassburg: 1897); the introduction to H. R. Lang's Liederbuch des Königs Denis von Portugal (Halle: 1894); and references under X, below.

In the passionate yet predominantly imitative lyrics of Spain, whether pulsing with the robust eloquence of the most sonorous of the Romance tongues, or fluttering with the tenderest and most beautiful of cadences, the student will find recurrent delight. In Spanish literature three strains must be considered more or less separately: (*a*) the Spanish strain proper, or the Castilian, which derives from the north-central, central, and southern parts of the Peninsula, including Aragon — always inclined toward the Castilian in speech, though for a while using Catalan as the official language of its court; (*b*) the Galician strain of the northwest, closely allied in language and development to Portuguese literature; (*c*) the Catalan strain deriving from the eastern littoral, closely allied in language and development to Provençal literature. First it will be proper to consider the presence of the troubadour lyric in each of these divisions; then the development of each division may be followed century by century. Only the barest historical outlines are presented here: further material is readily afforded by the larger histories of the literature.

A. *The Troubadour Lyric in Spain (12th century to close of the 15th).*

The best work on this subject is Milá y Fontanals' Los trovadores en España (Barcelona: 1861; 1887; vol. II of Obras Completas, 8 vols., 1888–96); for brief introductions see Chap. VIII of Chaytor's The Troubadours (Camb. Manuals of Science and Lit. 1912) and the article on Spanish literature in the Encyc. Brit., 11th ed. See also Gröber's Grundriss. F. J. Wolf's Studien zur Gesch. der spanischen und portugiesischen Nationalliteratur (Berlin: 1859) is still a most important work; its errors are corrected in the Castilian translation by D. Miguel de Unamuno, with notes by Menéndez y Pelayo (1895–96). José Amador de los Rios' Historia critica de la lit. española (7 vols. Madrid: 1861–65) and L. Clarus' Darstellung der spanischen Lit. im Mittelalter (Mainz: 1846) must be used with care.

1. *Castilian* (12th century to the end of the 15th). During the 12th and 13th centuries Provençal poetry exerted less influence on the native literature of Spain proper than on that of Galicia or Catalonia, probably because the luxurious *courtoisie* of the *langue d'oc* had less in common with the martial habits of Northern and Central Spain than with the more peaceful inclinations of the other districts. Indeed the Castilian tongue found its native and sincerest expression in epical verse, in the *cantares de gesta* and the *romanceros*, thus displaying an affinity with the literature of Northern rather than Southern France. Nevertheless, during these two centuries the kings of Aragon and Castile, Leon and Navarre, were famous as patrons of the Provençal troubadours, and we know of between thirty and forty Spanish poets who wrote court poetry in the Provençal tongue. Aragon and Provence for a time were even under the same king, Alfonso II of Aragon (1162–1196), and to his interests were devoted many troubadours, such as Peire Vidal, Peire Ramon of Toulouse, Uc Brunet, Uc de San Circ, and the Monk of Montaudon. Alfonso himself practised the

art. At the court of Castile the lyrics of Provence were particularly in evidence during the reigns of Alfonso VIII (1158–1214) and Alfonso X (1252–1284).

But all this verse-making was in the foreign tongue, and most of it in the form of poems actually imported from abroad. Upon poetry in the Castilian tongue it had little or no effect, though what has been called the oldest Castilian lyric, the La Rézon feite d'amor, by some attributed to Lope de Moros, does show foreign influence. The other remains of Castilian lyrism, such as the lyric (?) qualities of Gonzalo de Berceo's wooden Virgin's Lament, or of other religious poetry, should be studied as an aspect of the medieval religious lyric.

Castilian poetry of the 14th century offers little to the student of the lyric. The works of Juan Ruiz, the foremost of Spanish medieval poets, Pero Lopez, and the Jew, Sem Tob of Carrión, may be explored for lyrical qualities, and their relation to foreign sources may be considered. But with the 15th century occurred a revival of troubadour influence. In the first half of the century arose an affected, pretentious court poetry, called *arte de trobar*, made up of innumerable brief poems in Provençal vein, occasional (amatory, satirical, epigrammatic, didactic) in scope, and intricate in pattern. Collections of these ephemerae, called *cancioneros*, were made, such as Juan Alfonso de Baena's *cancionero* of the lyrics of the court of John II, or the collection, known as the Cancionero de Stúñiga, of the verse of those *trobadores* who attended Alfonso V of Aragon to Naples. In the 16th century more general collections were made (*Cancioneros generales*): see the collections of Juan Fernández de Constantia and of Hernando del Castillo, the latter issued at Valencia in 1511. These and the like collections afford a mass of material, from the hands of several hundred poets, which may be studied in comparison with the Provençal lyric with a view to determining extent and methods of variation in subject, treatment, and metrical form. There is here a definite and rich field for systematic observation of literary individuality and evolution.

This court lyric shows traces also of a study of the ancients, — particularly and naturally of Ovid, as the amatory poet of Rome *par excellence.* The investigation of such traces of antiquity affords a further opportunity for determining the methods of literary evolution. Nor should the low satiric poems of the age, such as Pero Torrellas' poem on women (Coplas de las calidades de las donas), or the anonymous (Rodrigo Cota?) and scurrilous Coplas del provincial and Coplas de mingo revulgo, be forgotten. During the same period (15th century), the imitation of Italian models became pronounced, — the beginning of that literary development which culminated in the next two centuries as the golden age of the Spanish lyric.

It is impossible to cite here an adequate list of the hundreds of poets represented in the *Cancioneros* and the Italian school. Among the greater lyrists were Iñigo Lopez de Mendoza (Marquis of Santillana) and Juan de Mena, both leaders in the Italian movement, Gomez and Jorge Manrique; among the minor poets were Sánchez Talavera, Fernán Pérez de Guzmán, Villasandino, Francisco Imperial, Ruy Páez de Ribera, Martinez de Medina, Carvajales, Pero Torrellas, Juan Álvarez Gato, Hernán Mexía, Rodrigo Cota, and a host of others who may be met in the *cancioneros.*

2. *Galician* (1200–1385). The Provençal influence was much stronger upon poetry written in the Galician-Portuguese dialect, perhaps because it found itself in natural affinity with a popular lyric poetry already in existence in the West. At any rate the native lyric was remodelled under the new influence.

The most popular of the types thus developed were *Cantigas de amor e de amigo* and *Cantigas de escarnho e de maldizer*; the former were love songs: when the poet speaks the song was one *de amor*; when the lady speaks (and she is unmarried, in contrast to the Provençal usage) the song was *de amigo.* This latter is a type developed independently by the Portuguese school. *Cantigas de escarnho* correspond in intention to the Provençal *sirventes*; if their satire was open and unrestrained they were *cantigas de maldizer.* They dealt for the most part with trivial court and personal affairs, and not with questions of national policy upon which the troubadours so often expressed their opinions. Changes in taste and political upheavals brought this literature to an end about 1385 and the progress of Portuguese poetry then ceases for some fifty years (Chaytor, 125–126).

In all, about 2000 poems from more than 150 poets remain from the Galician-Portuguese ramification of troubadour art. Its florescence was during the reigns of Alfonso X of Castile (1252–84), who wrote much in the Western dialect, and King Denis of Portugal (1279–1325). Alfonso's Cántigas é Loores de Nuestra Señora (or Cántigas de Santa María) and the Querellas which are doubtfully attributed to him make a collection of several hundred lyrics of considerable power and sincerity.

3. *Catalan* (12th century to the end of the 15th). Early Catalan literature is an appendage of Provençal letters. "Until about the second half of the 13th century there existed in the Catalan districts no other literature than the Provençal, and the poets of north-eastern Spain used no other language than that of the troubadours." Thus it may be seen that in the Spanish peninsula Provençal poetry exerted its strongest influence in the Catalan district. Among the earlier Catalan troubadours were Ramón Vidal de Besalú, Guillem de Bergadan, Uc de Mataplana, Guillem de Cervera, and Serveri de Gerona. These and many others produced the deft but rather vapid varieties of the troubadour lyric. But in the verse, some of it lyrical in character, of the famous Ramón Lull (Raymond Lully, *c.* 1235–1315) a combination of the spoken Catalan dialect and the Provençal dialect is noticeable; and the founding in 1393 at Barcelona, under the patronage of the King of Aragon, of a consistory of the "Gay Saber," modelled on that of Toulouse, marked the further development of a poetry somewhat more original and Catalan in character. The following century, the 15th, was the chief period of Catalan poetry. The new school, at the head of which was Auzias March of Valencia, the greatest of Catalan poets, and to which belonged, for example, Pau de Bellviure, Fran. Ferrer, Jordi de Sant Jordi, Pere and Jaume March, Pere Torroella, and Antoni Vallmanya, though following the general character of Provençal verse, is distinguished

by a peculiar stanza and by a diction approaching that of ordinary Catalan conversation. But by the end of the 15th century this literature had bloomed and faded.

The union of Aragon with Castile, and the resulting predominance of Castilian throughout Spain, inflicted a death-blow ón Catalan literature, especially on its artistic poetry, a kind of composition more ready than any other to avail itself of the triumphant idiom which soon came to be regarded by men of letters as the only noble one, and alone fit to be the vehicle of elevated or refined thoughts. The fact that a Catalan, Juan Boscan, inaugurates in the Castilian language a new kind of poetry, and that the Castilians themselves regard him as the head of a school, is important and characteristic; the date of the publication of the works of Boscan (1543) marks the end of Catalan poetry (Encyc. Brit., 11th ed., Art. Spanish Lit.).

It is interesting also to note that the first printed Spanish book (Les trobes en lahors de la Verge María, 1474; reprinted by F. M. Grajales, Valencia: 1894) is a collection of sacred verses written by forty-four poets who are mostly Catalan, though four write in Castilian.

Texts. The student will of course turn to the general collections of Spanish authors already mentioned, particularly to Menéndez y Pelayo's Antología de poetas líricos, etc. See also Antonio Paz y Mélia, Opúsculos literarios de los siglos XIV–XVI (1892). For the Provençal lyric see above, VII, B. The best edition of the Libro de buen Amor of Juan Ruiz is that published by Jean Ducamin (Toulouse: 1901. In Bibliothèque méridionale, I^{re} série, tome VI). Baena's Cancionero has been issued with an introductory essay on Castilian poetry of the 14th and 15th centuries by Francisque Michel (2 vols. Leipz.: 1860); the Cancionero de Stúñiga is in the Colección de libros españoles raros ó curiosos (vol. IV. Madrid: 1872). The Cancionero general of Hernando del Castillo has been published by La Sociedad de bibliófilos españoles (2 vols. Madrid: 1882); the Cancionero castellano del siglo XV, by Foulché-Delbosc (2 vols. Madrid: 1912–15). See also the edition of the Cancionero de Gomez Manrique by D. Antonio Paz y Mélia (2 vols. Madrid: 1885); T. Braga's Cancioneiro portuguez da Vaticana (Lisboa: 1878); E. G. Molteni's Il Canzonieri portoghese Colocchi-Brancuti, in the second vol. of the Communicazioni delle biblioteche di Roma (Halle:

1875–80); H. R. Lang's Liederbuch des Königs Denis von Portugal (Halle: 1894), and the same author's Cancioneiro gallego-castelhano, — the extant Galician poems of that lyric school (1350–1450), collected and edited with a literary study, etc. (N.Y.: 1902; Yale Bicentennial Pubs.). — The satirical Coplas are printed in the *Rev. hispanique*, vol. V, and in Menéndez y Pelayo's Antología, vols. III, IV. Santillana's poems have been edited by Amador de los Rios (Obras de Lopez de Mendoza, etc. Madrid: 1852); for Mena's verse see Las CCC del famosissimo poeta Juan de Mena (Sevilla: 1512), or the 1804 edition published by F. Sánchez. The handsome edition of Alfonso's Cantigas published by the Spanish Academy (2 vols. 1889) should also be noted. For texts of other authors see the bibliographical appendix to the latest French or Spanish edition of Fitzmaurice-Kelly's history of Spanish literature. For the ballad see Milá y Fontanals, Romancerillo Catalan (1882) and Lockhart's Spanish (Castilian) Ballads.

References. In addition to the more general works mentioned above, we may note here, for the classical influence upon Juan Ruiz and the lyrists of the 15th century, Rudolf Schevill's valuable Ovid and the Renascence in Spain (*Univ. of California Pubs. in Mod. Philol.*, vol. IV. No. I, 1913, pp. 28–86); compare W. Schröttner, Ovid und die Troubadours (Diss. Marburg: 1908), and Schevill's Studies in Cervantes: The Influence of Virgil (*Trans. Connecticut Acad. of Arts and Sciences.* XIII, 1908). On Mena's poetry there are studies by R. Foulché-Delbosc (in *Rev. hispanique*, vol. IX, 1902) and C. R. Post (in *Romanic Rev.*, vol. III, Nos. 2, 3, 1912); on Berceo see an article by F. Fernández y González in *La Razón* (1857). See also V. Balaguer, De la poesia provenzal en Castilla y en Leon (Madrid: 1877, cf. *Rev. d. langues romanes*, 13); E. Baret, Espagne et Provence (Paris: 1857), — "pleasing but superficial"; B. Croce, Primi contatti fra Spagna e Italia (Napoli: 1894); by the same, La lingua spagnuola in Italia (Roma: 1895); by the same, Ricerche ispano-italiane (Napoli: 1898); A. Helfferich, Raymund Lull und die Anfänge der catalonischen Lit.; A. Jeanroy, Les origines, etc., as noted above, § 5; A. Pagès, Auzias March et ses prédécesseurs (Paris: 1912; *Romania* 41: 426); Count Théodore de Puymaigre, Les vieux auteurs castillans (Paris: 1861–62; 2d ed., incomplete, 2 vols. Paris: 1889–90); by the same, La cour littéraire de Don Juan II. roi de Castille [1419–1454] (2 vols. Paris: 1893); B. Sanvisenti, I primi influssi di Dante, del Petrarca e del Boccaccio sulla letteratura spagnuola (Milano: 1902); P. Savj-Lopez, La lirica spagnuola in Italia nel sec. XV (in *Giorn. storico*, 41: 1, 1903).

B. *The Golden Age of Castilian Literature* (*16th and 17th centuries*).

The chief work of reference for this period is Morel-Fatio's L'Espagne au 16^e et 17^e siècle (Heilbronn: 1878). A convenient English view of the period is included in D. Hannay's Later Renaissance (N.Y.: 1898). F. Wolf's Ein Beitrag zur Bibliographie der Cancioneros und zur Gesch. der span. Kunstlyrik am Hofe Karls V [1516–66] (Wien: 1853) is valuable for the part of the period precedent to the full splendor of the age (1550–1650). Most of the lyric material of these two centuries will be found in Rivadeneyra's Biblioteca de autores españoles (see the volumes entitled Poetas líricos de los siglos XVI y XVII); further bibliography of texts is mentioned at the head of this section. See Longfellow's Poets and Poetry of Europe for translations of selected poems. Wiffen has translated some of G. de la Vega's poems in his now antiquated life of that poet (1823).

Two main movements, more or less antagonistic, but both symptomatic of literary vitality, characterize the history of the Spanish lyric during the 16th century. The first of these, the Italian or Petrarchist school, has already been foreshadowed in the influence of Italian models in 15th century Castilian poetry; and we have spoken of the great Catalan, Juan Boscan, who by his Castilian lyrics in the Italian manner marked at once the surrender of Catalan to Castilian as a literary language and the florescence of the great Italian movement of Spain's Golden Age. Since it followed the writers of the Italian renaissance, particularly Petrarch, the new school was largely amatory, pastoral, and epistolary in character. To the grace and ardor of Italian models the Spanish imitators were by no means blind, but their devotion had in it much of aristocratic fashion, much of self-gratulation on being learned, *comme il faût*, in the new way. A profitable study is the means by which the Italian models entered Spain and the steps of their progress there; and careful attention may be given to the earlier (15th century) introduction of new prosodical forms (hendecasyllabics, sonnets, *canciones* (*canzoni*), tercets, octaves, etc.), the growth of new methods of appreciation and poetic treatment, the vitality of the new modes, and the variation of the Spanish creations from the Italian models ("refraction"). Of especial interest in this connection is Ticknor's statement, referred to by Hannay, *op. cit.*, p. 30, that it is possible to see exactly how at least one literary revolution — this of the Italian school — began. For Boscan's letter on the matter see the reference as given by Hannay. To what degree did this school go directly to the ancients, particularly Horace, Virgil, and Ovid, for inspiration and 'color'? Did it show a more mature understanding of poetic aims and a more facile adaptation of classical models than the classical imitators of the previous century? The leaders of the Italian school were Boscan, Garcilaso de la Vega, and Diego Hurtado de Mendoza. Lyrists who followed in their lead, and made truer and more technically perfect their way of poetic progression, were Gutierre de Cetina, Fernando de Herrera, Juan de Arguijo, Manuel de Villegas, Gregorio Silvestre, Hernando de Acuña, Luis Ponce de Leon, etc.

The other movement of the 16th century sprang from a protest against the imitation of foreign models. Under the guidance of Cristobal de Castillejo the national school bitterly opposed the Petrarchists and stuck manfully to the native Castilian measures; but the innovators were the party of growth and so completely did they finally assimilate the poetic vigor of the age that by the end of the century their verse was no longer regarded as a foreign graft on the national stock.

The 17th century luxuriated in a riot of lyrism, the outstanding novel feature of which is the intricate and far-fetched style of Góngora and his followers, the 'cultist' school. The source of this movement, its relation to Marinism in Italy, to the French school of preciosity, and to English Euphuism is the topic of considerable research. The wider significance of such highly artificial play with words and ideas (consider similar movements in Greek, Roman, and Oriental literatures) may be studied from the point of view of the psychology of literary fads or fashions. What of the social and economic environment in which such play thrives, the seriousness of its endeavor, or the patronizing attitude and self-conceit of its devotees? The list of the Spanish poetasters of this style (*culto* or Gongorism) is a long one that need not be cited here; the multitude of their poems has fortunately been somewhat thinned by time. In the very immensity of their industry as well as by the artificiality of their conceptions and methods they marked the first falling away from the acme of lyric creation that had been reached in the previous century.

References. M. Catalina, La poesía lírica en el teatro antigua (7 vols. Madrid: 1909–11); E. Churton, Góngora (Lond.: 1862); B. Croce, Intorno al soggiorno di Garcilaso de la Vega in Italia (Napoli: 1894); *Edinb. Rev.*, 40: 443 (1823), an article in review of Wiffen's translation of G. de la Vega's poems; F. Flamini, a valuable study of Boscan contained in the author's Studi di storia letteraria italiana e straniera (Livorno: 1895); by the same, an article on G. de la Vega's Italian imitations (in *La biblioteca delle Scuole italiane*, Milano, July 1899); E. Mérimée, Essai sur la vie et les œuvres de Fr. de Quevedo (1886); C. Michaëlis de Vasconcellos, Investigações sobre sonetos e sonetistas portugueses e castelhanos (in *Rev. hispanique*, 22. 1910) — Petrarchism in Spain, pp. 509–614; R. Mitzana, Cincuenta y cuatro canciones españolas del siglo XVI, etc. (Upsala: 1909); C. L. Nicolay, The Life and Works of Cristóbal de Castillejo (Philadelphia: 1910); *Rev. hispanique*, vols. IV, VII, materials *re* Góngora; P. Savj-Lopez, Un petrarchista spagnuolo, Gutierre de Cetina (Vecchi: 1896); R. Schevill, Ovid and the Renascence in Spain (cited above, under A, References), — chapter on the influence of Ovid on the Spanish lyric of the 16th century; A. Schneider, Spaniens Antheil an der deutschen Litt. des 16. und 17. Jahrhdts. (Strassburg: 1898); L. P. Thomas, Le lyrisme et la préciosité cultistes en Espagne (*Beiheft z. Zeitschr. f. roman. Philol.*, No. 18. Halle: 1909); by the same, Gongora et le gongorisme considérés dans leurs rapports avec le marinisme (Paris: 1911); A. L. de la Vega y Arguëlles, Historia y juicio crítico de la Escuela Poética Sevillana (1871), — "useful, and even exhaustive, but far too eulogistic in tone"; B. Sanvisenti, as noted above, p. 255. — Further references in Ticknor, Fitzmaurice-Kelly, etc.

Many valuable suggestions on the psychology of fashion, which may be applied to such literary movements as Gongorism, Marinism, and Euphuism, are to be found in E. A. Ross' Social Psychology (N.Y.: 1908); compare Tarde's Laws of Imitation and McDougall's Introd. to Social Psychology.

C. *Castilian Lyric of the 18th Century.*

For this century a satisfactory guide will be found in L. A. de Cueto's Poesía castellana en el siglo XVIII, being the preface to vol. I of Poet. líricos del siglo XVIII in Rivadeneyra's Biblioteca; use the revised edition of this article, Historia crítica de la poesía castellana, etc. (Madrid: 1893). A. M. A. Galiano's Hist. de la lit. españ., francesa, inglesa, é ital. en el siglo XVIII (1845) is "acute, but somewhat obsolete." Menéndez y Pelayo's Historia de las ideas estéticas en España (vol. III, part ii, 1886) contains valuable and illuminating material on the period.

The 18th century in Spain was a period of national decline, and the lyric, already vitiated by Gongorism, showed but little power under the French influences that now invaded Spain to see or feel life deeply and imaginatively. Ignacio de Luzán, the critic of the period, whose Poética appeared in 1737, acknowledged Boileau as his master, and it was under such auspices that the stream of lyrism wound its way through this period. The ode, of course, had its devotees under this régime and once more paradoxically marked a decrease in poetic vigor. One may pause here to question whether the Spanish lyric is not characterized by a certain absence of national originality. In the earlier period, the Provençal troubadour influence usurped the field; then came the Petrarchist renaissance, victorious over the nationalist school; Gongorism can hardly illustrate a striking lyric originality; and here, in the 18th century, even a lyric decline proceeds under foreign tutelage. What has constituted Spanish originality during these centuries? some national habits of treatment, diction, or range of thought and feeling? merely some national "refraction" of foreign rays? Is it true that the Spanish temperament is on the whole more at home in romance and epical narrative, in dramatic and novelistic composition, in the portrayal of events and conflicts, and the analysis of character than in the expression of a deeply personal and individually passionate view of life? Does the national character prefer the representation of passion to its individual presentation? Or should we turn to popular poetry if we wish to find the true lyrical output of the Spanish people, to those brief lyrics of four or eight lines which time out of mind have been the traditional Spanish method of expressing the spontaneous emotion of the throng (see Marin's Cantos populares, mentioned at the head of this division)? Such considerations as these may serve to illumine the general history of the type. Among the poets of this century Meléndez Valdés, Diego Gonzáles, José Iglesias de la Casa, and Leandro Fernández de Moratín (dramatist) may be taken as representative of the French school.

D. *Castilian Lyric of the 19th Century.*

F. Blanco García's Lit. española en el siglo XIX (3 vols. Madrid: 1891–94; later editions also) is regarded as uncritical. J. Amador de los Rios published in 1876 his Del estado actual de la poesía lírica en España. Enrique Piñeyro's El romanticismo en España (Paris: 1904) is helpful.. See also M. G. Hubbard, Histoire de la lit. contemporaine en Espagne (Paris: 1876); B. de Tannenberg, La poésie castellane contemporaine (1892). For a very brief but appreciative account see the article Spanish Lit. in the Encyc. Brit., 11th ed., 25: 586 b. For an anthology see J. Valera, Florilegio de poesías castellanas del siglo XIX (5 vols. Madrid: 1901–04).

Here, too, the artistic lyric betrays the imitative tendency. In spite even of the national outburst in defiance of Napoleon the literature of the century continued in the French manner, as may be seen in the patriotic odes of Quintana and the classical verse of Martínez de la Rosa. Romanticism next made its appearance, the romanticism of the French followers of Byron: Espronceda and Zorilla are the Spanish followers in this lead. In poets of a later generation: V. W. Querol, F. Balart, J. M. Bartrina, M. Reina, M. del Palacio, A. de Escalante y Prieto ("Juan García"), L. R. Martínez y Guertero, etc., other French influences, naturalism, materialism, Parnassianism, etc., may be traced. The popular measures of Campoamor, on the other hand, and the patriotic verse of Núñez de Arce, as well as the delightful Andalusian lyrics of Salvador Rueda, the Murcian airs of Vicente Medina, the Majorcan pictures of Juan Alcover and Miguel Costa, and the Catalan spirit of R. D. Perés bear witness to a truly national inspiration: they are a promise of what Spain may yet accomplish if her poets will but sing simply, and yet with something more than popular naïveté, of that which is closest to the heart.

E. *Catalan Decline and Revival* (*16th century to the present*).

On the Catalan revival see the following, taken from the Encyc. Brit., 11th ed., 25: 591 a: J. Rubió y Ors, Breve reseña del actual renacimiento de la lengua y literatura catalanas (2 vols. Barcelona: 1880); F. M. Tubino, Historia del renacimiento contemporáneo en Cataluña, Baleares y Valencia (Madrid: 1880); A. de Molins, Diccionario biográfico y bibliográfico de escritores y artistas catalanes del siglo XIX (Barcelona: 1891–96); E. Toda, La poesía catalana á Sardenya (Barcelona: 1888).

Of the fall of Catalan and Catalan literature at the close of the 15th century we have already spoken. During the next three centuries Catalan ceased to be a literary language of any moment. The 16th century produced only one poet of note, Pere Serafí, who wrote in somewhat the style of the greatest Catalan poet, Auzias March. The early 17th century produced the over-rated Vicent Garcia; the 18th, practically nothing of lyric value. But during the 19th, an enthusiastic revival occurred, which speaks well for the future.

X. **The Portuguese Lyric.**

The lyric of Portugal may be approached through Gröber (the admirable Gesch. der port. Litt., by Mme. Michaëlis de Vasconcellos) and Körting, and through the literary histories of Braga, Loiseau, Bouterwek, and Mendes dos Remedios, cited in the Appendix. The English reader may turn to the article on Portuguese Lit., by Edgar Prestage, in the Encyc. Brit., 11th ed.; Ross' translation of Bouterwek, and to the brief notices in the various volumes of the series, Periods of European Lit., edited by Professor Saintsbury; see also Articles in the *Quarterly Rev.* 1: 235 and the *Foreign Quart. Rev.* 10: 437. Longfellow's Poets and Poetry of Europe will be an aid here as it was in the case of the Spanish lyric (see pp. 730–760). The student should also consult the Bosquejo da história da poesia e língua portugueza, by

Almeida Garrett, in Fonseca's Parnaso lusitano, — the principal collection of Portuguese poetry (6 vols. Paris: 1826), A. Fenix Renascida, Obras poéticas dos melhores engenhos portugueses (2d ed. 3 vols. Lisbon: 1746), and J. J. Nunes, Chrestomathia archaica (1905). Bibliographical works are cited in the article in the Encyc. Brit., and in Gröber.

Portuguese poetry is famous for the extent and excellence of its lyric and pastoral verse. The history of this literature shows a succession of foreign influences similar to that noted in Spanish poetry. But in spite of Provençal, Castilian, Italian, and French influences, the Portuguese lyric developed a very considerable originality. Examination of the kind and degree of such originality, and of its relation to environment, may, if assisted by comparative study of the environment of the less original Spanish lyric, lead to some hypothesis concerning the conditions (psychological, social, economic, etc.) which favor strong variation, or invention, within generally imitative movements.

(1) Of the original contribution (*Cantares de amigo*) of the Portuguese troubadours (end of the 12th century to *c.* 1385), resulting probably from an amalgamation of a lost indigenous lyrism of love with the imported Provençal forms, we have already spoken (see above IX, A, 2). Of this palace poetry we possess the famous collection, oldest of the Iberian peninsula and illustrative of the poetic vitality of the age of Alfonso III (1248–79), known as the *Cancioneiro da Ajuda*. From the age of King Diniz (or Denis; 1279–1325) we have the *Cancioneiro da Vaticana*. See also the *romanceiro* (ed. V. E. Hardung) for lyrical material. Notice the variety of subjects, and, especially, the excellence of the satirical verse of this body of poetry, the degree of individuality shown by various authors, such as King Diniz, D. Alfonso Sanches, D. Pedro, etc., the variety of Provençal metres and the attempts to invent others, and the absence of heroic subjects, as compared with early Castilian poetry. — (2) The lyric remains of the 15th century — revealing a Spanish-Italian influence (decay of Provençal forms, rise of allegorical tendencies and classicism) — are to be found in the *Cancioneiro Geral*,

collected by Garcia de Resende and printed in 1516. Some of the hundreds of poets here represented are: D. Pedro of Portugal, D. João Manuel, D. João de Menezes, João Rodrigues de Sá e Menezes, Diogo Brandão, Duarte de Brite, Fernão da Silveira, and Garcia de Resende. Another group in the same collection (Bernardim Ribeiro, Christovam Falcão, Gil Vicente, and Sá de Miranda) marks the transition to the Italian school of the next century. Ribeiro and Falcão introduced the bucolic style; their verse reveals exceptional charm of imagery, feeling, and diction. — (3) The classical renaissance of the 16th century, carried on under Italian influence and initiated by Sá de Miranda, was a most vital, complete, and permanent revolution, involving the practice of canzons, sonnets, octaves and tercets, epigrams, odes, and pastoral forms. In the last sort considerable initiative was displayed early in the century. But the national measure, a redondilha metre (cf. popular poetry of Spain, as noted above, IX), was also employed with fine effect, and in the greatest poet of this period of efflorescence, Luiz de Camoens, the classical and native influences were amalgamated, and transfused with a dignity, significance, and universality that show us the Portuguese lyric (and epic) at its best. Thus, as in previous centuries, the literature of this people manages to achieve from the union of native vigor and form with foreign learning and style a surprising degree of inventive spontaneity. Among the poets of the period Prestage (*op. cit.*) mentions, in addition to Camoens, Sá de Miranda, Ant. Ferreira, D. Manoel de Portugal, Pero de Andrade Caminha, Diego Bernardes, Frei Agostinho da Cruz, and André Falcão de Resende. — (4) The 17th century was an age of decline, — Castilian in influence, rhetorical and precious in conception and expression. Gongorism (see above, under Spanish Lyric) appears, learned and absurd but on the whole helpful, and academies are founded. Thus the two European fads of the age produce in Portugal as elsewhere a mass of extravagant, artificial lyrism. — (5) During the 18th century several attempts, under French influence, were made to improve the quality of Portuguese poetry.

Of these one of the chief centered in the school known as the *Arcadia Ulysiponense* (founded 1756) and, later, in the New Arcadia (from 1790 on). As respects the lyric, some correction of the extravagances of the previous century was attained: from the study of the classics, a reinstatement of balance and restraint, and a developed appreciation — formal and conventional, to be sure — of the worth of honest construction. — (6) The romantic revival of the 19th century, under French, English, and German influence, produced the poetic and liberal patriots Garrett and Herculano, who broke with Arcadian rules and produced lyrics at once individual in form, personal in feeling, and national in inspiration. The romantic extremist, A. F. de Castilho, and his followers were checked, however, by a celebrated dispute, the Coimbran; and from this in turn arose a new poetic school of much creative energy (João de Deus, Anthero de Quental, and the other Coimbrans). The other 19th-century influences, intellectual and aesthetic — pantheism and skepticism, materialism and naturalism, symbolism and Parnassianism — may be discovered in the undiminished tide of native lyrical and enthusiastic expression. No lover of the lyric will feel that the difficulty — but slight — of learning to read this poetry in the original is not amply repaid by the pleasure gained. In this most lyrical of national literatures the horizons are not always new, but they repeatedly disclose realms of fresh color and marvellous fertility.

References and Texts. For the study of the earlier periods, in addition to the orientation afforded by general histories, special assistance is afforded by F. Wolf's Studien zur Geschichte der spanischen und portugiesischen Nationalliteratur (Berlin: 1859); T. Braga, Cancioneiro portuguez da Vaticana (Lisbon: 1878), which contains a valuable introduction treating of the origin and diffusion of Provençal poetry in modern Europe, the Italian-Provençal period (1114–1245), Provençal poetry at the courts of Alfonso III (1246–1279) and Dom Diniz (1279–1325), and the *Cancioneiros* of the 13th and 14th centuries (the body of the work consists of a critical edition of the Vatican *cancioneiro*). See also the same author's collection of lyrics in his Cancioneiro e romanceiro geral portuguez; and the Trovadores Gallecio-Portuguezes in his Historia da Litteratura Portugueza, vol. VIII (1871); F. Diez, Ueber die erste portugiesische Kunst und Hofpoesie (Bonn: 1863); H. R. Lang, Das Liederbuch des Königs Denis von Portugal (Halle: 1894), and his Zum Cancioneiro da Ajuda (in *Zeitschr. für romanische Philol.* 32: 129–160, 290–311, 385–399. 1908); also by the same, The Relations of the Earliest Portuguese Lyric School with the Troubadours and Trouvères (in *Mod. Lang. Notes*, X. 1895); O. Nobiling, Die Lieder des Trobadors D. Joan Garcia de Guilhade, 13. Jahrhdt. (Erlangen: 1907); by the same, Introducçõa ao estudo da mais antiga poesia portugueza (in *Revista da Sociedade scientifica de São Paulo*, vol. II, 1907, pp. 153–158, and vol. III,. 1908, pp. 1–9). See, also, articles in the *Revue hispanique*. — For *texts* of Portuguese-troubadour poetry, see Lang's Liederbuch, etc., mentioned above; E. Monaci, Canzoniere portoghese della Bibliotheca Vaticana (1875); E. Molteni, Canzoniere portoghese Colocci-Brancuti (1880); C. Michaëlis de Vasconcellos, Cancioneiro da Ajuda (1904). Some notice of this period will be found above (IX, Spanish Lyric) under the account of the early Galician-Portuguese lyric.

For the modern lyric, see Lopes de Mendonça, Memoiras da litt. contemporanea (1855); Romero Ortiz, La lit. portugueza en el siglo XIX (1869); M. Formont, Le mouvement poétique contemporain en Portugal; M. Barreto, Litt. port. contemporanea (in *Revista de Portugal*, July 1889); T. Braga, Parnaso portuguez moderno (Lisbon: 1877). — On the Portuguese popular lyric, see C. F. Bellermann, Portugies. Volkslieder und Romanzen (Leipz.: 1864), and the same author's Die alten Liederbücher der Portug., etc. (Berlin: 1840).

XI. **The English Lyric.**

For *general introductions* to the history of the English lyric, see the works of Schelling (The English Lyric) and Rhys, noted above, §§ 2, 5; Reed, § 2; F. I. Carpenter's Outline Guide to the Study of English Lyric Poetry (Chicago: 1897; cf. Carpenter's English Lyric Poetry, 1500–1700); and the sketches of Beers, Chambers, Dennis, as noted above, § 5. The more important histories of English prosody, for instance Saintsbury's, offer much material (for other references, see Gayley and Scott, §§ 23, 24 (3)). In the various volumes of the Cambridge Hist. of Eng. Lit. will be found chapters dealing with the lyric and valuable bibliographical appendixes (indicated, below, under periods, subjects, and authors). Morley's English Writers contains bibliographies covering the literature to the time of King James. Courthope's History of Eng. Poetry and the several literary histories mentioned in the Appendix to this volume should be consulted. See also Bray's History of English Critical Terms, under 'Lyrical,' and Hepple's Lyrical Forms in English.

For criticism of works as they appear, the student will of course turn to such *Reviews* as are cited in the Appendix. Special mention may be made of the *Anglia Beiblatt* and the *Jahresbericht über die Erscheinungen auf dem Gebiete der germanischen Philologie*. Valuable monographs, especially for the earlier periods, will be found in *Anglia*, *Englische Studien*, *Palaestra*, *Anglistische Forschungen*, *Studien zur Englischen Philologie*, *Pubs. Mod. Lang. Ass.*, and other philological journals.

For references on *Scottish poetry*, see the Appendix, and the works of Veitch, Cunningham, Ritson, Scott, Blackie, Motherwell, noted above, § 5; a valuable bibliography of Scottish literature from the seventeenth century onwards, by H. G. Aldis, is appended to vol. IX of the Camb. Hist. Eng. Lit. (1913).

For a convenient list of *General Anthologies* of English Poetry, see Schelling's Eng. Lyric, pp. 307–308. Some of the more important are: Arber's British Anthologies (10 vols. 1899–1901; from Dunbar to Cowper); Chalmers' English Poets (21 vols. 1810); Henley's English Lyrics (1897); Hunt and Lee's Book of the Sonnet (2 vols. Boston ed. 1867); Locker-Lampson's Lyra Elegantiarum (1867; enlarged ed. by C. Kernahan, 1891; the best collection of *Vers de Société*); Palgrave's Golden Treasury (1882; unsurpassed), and Treasury of Sacred Song (1889); Quiller-Couch's English Sonnets (1910); Ward's English Poets (4 vols. 1885); and the Oxford Book of English Verse, 1250–1900, the Oxford Book of Victorian Verse (both edited by Sir Arthur Quiller-Couch), the Oxford Book of Canadian Verse (edited by W. Campbell), the Edinburgh Book of Scottish Verse, 1300–1900 (ed. by W. M. Dixon), the Dublin Book of Irish Verse, 1728–1909 (ed. by John Cooke), and other Oxford anthologies of poems of war, patriotism, the sea, etc.

A. *Anglo-Saxon Lyrics (to 1150).*

As general *introductions* to the Anglo-Saxon lyric, see especially the proper sections in Courthope, in the Camb. Hist. of Eng. Lit., in A. Brandl's Englische Lit. (in Paul's Grundriss, 1901, II, 1, p. 941 ff.), in the histories of the English lyric just given, and Chap. II of Erskine's Elizabethan Lyric. Excellent bibliographical appendixes in the Camb. Hist. Eng. Lit.; see also H. M. Ayres, Bibliog. Sketch of Anglo-Saxon Lit. (Columbia Univ. N.Y.: 1910). The great *collection* of

Anglo-Saxon poetry is that of C. W. M. Grein and R. P. Wülker (Bibliothek der angelsächsischen Poesie, new ed., 2 vols. Leipz.: 1894). For other collections, see Schelling's English Lyric, pp. 309–311.

Study of the Anglo-Saxon lyric must be concerned with Anglo-Saxon lyrics that show no Christian influence, with early Christian or Christianized lyrics, and with the lyrical qualities contained in other, especially narrative, poetry of the period. Elegies, riddles, charm-songs, war-songs, religious lyrics, and the lyric of subjective personality (*Widsith and Deor*; see Chap. II of Erskine's Elizabethan Lyric) are comprised within the lyric field proper; but certain aspects of Cynewulf's poems and the pseudo-Cynewulfian poems offer valuable testimony to the lyrical quality of the ages before the Conquest. The following topics of historical study are suggestive, not exhaustive: sources of the various kinds, and of the individual lyrics; probable conditions of authorship (relative force of communal and individual factors); methods of diffusion or "publication" (by minstrels, etc.); relative ages of the different kinds, and generalizations, based on such inquiry, as to laws of historical sequence; the evidence for general stages of lyric growth, as derived from a study of sequence in metrical forms, or of the relation of the lyrics to magic and successive forms of religion, or of the order in which objective and subjective materials were used, or of the priority of communal to personal interests, etc. — All these topics, moreover, should be studied comparatively, that is, in connection with analogous materials in other literatures.

References. R. Burton, Nature in Old English Poetry (in *Atlantic Mo.*, April, 1894); F. B. Gummere, The Popular Ballad (Boston: 1907), Chap. I, § 3, and Chap. II, § 1, also Index, under Lyric; by the same, Germanic Origins (N.Y.: 1892), and The Beginnings of Poetry (N.Y.: 1901); E. D. Hanscom, Feeling for Nature in O. E. Poetry (in *Journ. Eng. and Germ. Philol.* 5: 439. 1903–05); H. Paul, Grundriss der germanischen Philologie (2 Aufl., Bd. II, Abt. 1, Strassburg: 1901–1909, p. 973 ff., and 1034, early A.-S. lyric, and later A.-S. sacred lyric; references on pp. 980, 1035. 1036); L. L. Schücking, Das angelsächsische Totenklagelied (in *Englische Studien* 39: 1. 1908);

W. O. Stevens, The Cross in the Life and Literature of the Anglo-Saxons (in *Yale Studies in English*, No. 23. 1904); R. Wülker, Grundriss zur Geschichte der angelsächsischen Litteratur (Leipz.: 1885): under the proper headings may be found notes of the older editions, translations, and dissertations; on the Riddles, see § 71; the Wanderer, § 137; the Seafarer, § 144; the Ruin, § 150; "Riming Poem," § 158; (Widsith, § 300 ff.); Charms, § 352 ff.; religious poems, § 397 ff.; etc.; later bibliography is given in vol. I of the Camb. Hist. of Eng. Lit., pp. 473–475; for further references the student should examine the periodicals mentioned in the Appendix.

B. *Middle English Lyrics* (*to 1500*).

For general *introductions* to the Middle English lyric see the works already cited above as general introductions to the Anglo-Saxon lyric. Professor Schofield's English Lit. from the Norman Conquest to Chaucer (Lond. and N.Y.: 1906) is indispensable for this period; see especially pp. 133–136 (Anglo-Norman and Anglo-French Lyrics and Debates), Chap. X (English Songs and Lyrics: Religious and Didactic, Secular), and the corresponding sections of the bibliographical Appendix. See also J. E. Wells, A Manual of the Writings in Middle English (1916), and C. S. Baldwin, Introd. to Eng. Medieval Lit., Chap. V (N.Y.: 1914). — For *collections* of Middle English lyrics, see Schelling's English Lyric, pp. 309–311; Schofield, p. 486. K. Böddeker's Altenglische Dichtungen des MS. Harl. 2253 (Berlin: 1878), or Thomas Wright's publication of the same MS. for the Percy Society (Specimens of Lyric Poetry, 1842), R. Jordan's Kleinere Dichtungen der Hs. Harley 3810 (in *Eng. Studien* 41: 253. 1910), J. L. Weston's The Chief Middle English Poets (Boston: 1914), Neilson and Webster's Chief British Poets of the 14th and 15th Centuries (1916), and Chambers and Sidgwick's Early English Lyrics (1907) afford representative materials. Ellis' Specimens of the Early English Poets (3 vols. 1790) made popular many of the older lyrics. See also Sir John Stainer's Early Bodleian Music (Lond.: 1901).

The history of the lyric after the Conquest resolves itself practically into the introduction of new themes and forms, usually from abroad, and the gradual acclimatization or rejection of these novelties. Among the new or nearly new themes are those of love, of satire as directed against women, of the lullaby, of the pastoral (Henryson's Robene and Makyne), and of national, as distinct from feudal, patriotism (Laurence Minot); among the new forms are the *ballade*, *rondel*, *pastourelle*, *débat*, etc. It is obvious that under the circumstances the chief task of historical research becomes the study of the nature of the foreign influences, the means by which they became effective in England, the transformations they produced or underwent, and the methods by which these transformations were accomplished. Foreign influences came for the most part from the French troubadours and trouvères and from Italianized Provençal poems. For references to these the student should turn to the notes on the French and the Italian lyric in this section. The influence of Latin lyrics, including hymns and Goliardic poems (for which see above, IV; V, E), is also of significance. Most of the new influences may be traced in the works of Chaucer and his followers, and in the Scottish poets of the time.

If, on the other hand, the student concern himself with the purely native lyric, he will turn to the folk songs and carols of the age; and to more pretentious poems that show a modicum of foreign influence, — the work, for instance, of Skelton. The effect upon the lyric of the growing sense of nationality from the middle of the fourteenth century on suggests also a vital subject of study. Can the lyric of feudalism be distinguished in any systematic fashion from the lyric of Englishry and genuine folk feeling? What testimony do other literatures, ancient as well as modern, offer in this respect?

The general diffusion of the lyrical spirit in this period may be compared as to extent and earnestness with that of former and successive periods. The condition, moreover, of English prosody at the time is a subject of particular interest (see Saintsbury's Hist. of English Prosody). "A careful study of the various metres of these poems [i.e. in the Harleian MS.] will show that, in spite of occasional lapses from strict metrical propriety, there was practically no secret of English prosody which was not at least ready to be unlocked for English poets" (Saintsbury, A Short Hist. of Eng. Lit., p. 67. N.Y.: 1905).

References. J. Aust, Beiträge zur Geschichte der mittelenglischen Lyrik (in *Archiv*, vol. LXX. 1883); A. Brandl, Spielmannsverhältnisse in frühmittelenglischer Zeit (*Sitzungsberichte der königl. preuss. Akad.*, 1910); E. K. Chambers, The Mediaeval Stage (2 vols. 1903), — treats incidentally of lyric and folk-lyric; by the same, Some Aspects of the Mediaeval Lyric (in Chambers and Sidgwick's Early English Lyrics, 1907 — see above, § 5); H. J. Chaytor, Provençal Influence in Germany, France, and England, being Chap. IX of his The Troubadours (Camb. Manuals of Sc. and Lit. 1912); F. J. Crowest, The Story of the Carol (Lond.: 1911); E. Gattinger, Die Lyrik Lydgates (in *Wiener Beiträge z. eng. Phil.*, No. 4. 1896); M. Haessner, Die Goliardendichtung u. d. Satire im 13. Jahrh. in England (1905); O. Heider, Untersuchungen zur mittelenglischen erotischen Lyrik, 1250–1300 (Halle Diss.: 1905); J. J. Jusserand, English Wayfaring Life in the Middle Ages (1890); A. Koelbing, Skelton (Chap. IV of Camb. Hist. Eng. Lit., vol. III, 1909); E. Köppel, Gowers franz. Balladen und Chaucer (in *Engl. Studien* XX, 1895); A. Müller, Mitteleng. geistl. u. welt. Lyrik d. XIII. Jahrh. etc. (1910); W. A. Neilson, Origins and Sources of the Court of Love (1900); F. A. Patterson, The Middle English Penitential Lyric (N.Y.: 1911. Diss., Columbia), — contains a collection of penitential lyrics, with notes and bibliography, and an introduction classifying Middle English religious lyrics, and studying the influences that brought about the development of the vernacular lyric; J. Schipper, Dunbar, sein Leben und seine Gedichte (1884); E. Rickert, Ancient English Christmas Carols (Lond.: 1910); Vollhardt, Einfluss der lat. geistlichen Litt. auf einige kleinere Schöpfungen der engl. Uebergangsperiode, — for the influence of Latin Christian literature on English poetry of 1150–1250; C. J. Sharp, English Folk-Carols (Lond.: 1911). See also references given above under the history of the French Lyric, VII, A–F.

C. *The Sixteenth Century.*

The best *introductions* to the lyric literature of this age are F. M. Padelford's Early Sixteenth Century Lyrics (Boston: 1907, — the introductory essay), J. Erskine's The Elizabethan Lyric (N.Y.: 1903), F. E. Schelling's Eng. Lyric, and the same author's introduction to his Book of Elizabethan Lyrics. — For bibliography of *collections* of Elizabethan lyrics, see Schelling's English Lyric, pp. 313–315; Erskine, *op. cit.*, pp. 315–325; Camb. Hist. Eng. Lit., Appendixes, vols. II and III; Bolle, Child, Flügel, Padelford, etc., as noted below, under References.

The sixteenth century in England and Scotland offers an extraordinarily rich and varied field for the student of lyric development. The beginner had better concern himself with some single topic. He may, for instance, study with profit the relation of the Elizabethan lyric to the Middle English as regards, first, the modification of old popular themes by the influence of courtly life, and, second, the addition of new themes. In the progress from the popular to the art lyric, he may trace the steps from the predominance of music over words to the predominance of the latter and, eventually, to the exclusion of music. Other topics include the influence of Petrarch upon form and matter, involving the introduction of the sonnet; the influence of French forms, with special reference to the Pléiade (cf. above, VII, G); pastoral quality; elegiac quality; epigrammatic quality; development of subjective content; classification of contents or themes, their provenience, and the rationale of their development; the use of the refrain in practical song and art lyric; the conventions, artificialities, or conceits of the Elizabethan lyric; the influence of Wyatt and Surrey, etc. — The materials supplied by the many lyrical Miscellanies, beginning with Tottel's, 1557, and continuing through the Paradyse of Daynty Devises, 1576, the Gorgious Gallery, 1578, the Handefull of Pleasant Delites, 1584, etc. (see Erskine), afford unusual opportunities for the study of a type in sequence. The general relation of these Miscellanies to the public furnishes, in turn, a clue to the popular propensity for lyrical expression; but a study of this kind will involve that also of the material to be found in the Song-Books (where the madrigal is of particular interest). — The Sonnet Sequences, such as those of Sidney and Shakespeare, offer a fruitful field of investigation in the development of form and theme, as does also the influence of the classics in the pastorals, elegiacs, epigrams, and sonnets of Grimald, Googe, Turberville, and others. — The history of the lyric in the drama begins with the miracle plays and runs through well-defined stages as the drama and masque develop; the incidental lyric in Elizabethan romances suggests another subject of study. — In addition to such researches, studies of development and reciprocal influence may be undertaken in connection with particular authors or sets of authors. The sources and influence, for instance, of Wyatt, Surrey, Sidney, Gascoigne, Lord Vaux, Grimald, Watson, Constable, Barnes, Breton (for a full list, in chronological order of publication, see Erskine, pp. 305–311) call for examination in detail; and the names of Spenser and Shakespeare suggest a host of problems involving not only the determination of sources but of the way in which the lyric in its culmination is related to the practice of preceding and succeeding writers.

It is obvious that many such investigations, of which only a few are suggested here, must be completed before satisfactory generalizations can be made in regard to the general growth of the lyric during the sixteenth century.

Palgrave, in summarizing the style of the Elizabethan lyric, says:

> There is here a wide range of style; — from simplicity expressed in a language hardly yet broken-in to verse, — through the pastoral fancies and Italian conceits of the strictly Elizabethan time, — to the passionate reality of Shakespeare: yet a general uniformity of tone prevails. Few readers can fail to observe the natural sweetness of the verse, the single-hearted straightforwardness of the thoughts: — nor less, the limitation of subject to the many phases of one passion, which then characterized our lyrical poetry, — unless when, as in especial with Shakespeare, the 'purple light of Love' is tempered by a spirit of sterner reflection. For the didactic verse of the century, although lyrical in form, yet very rarely rises to the pervading emotion, the golden cadence, proper to the lyric (Golden Treasury: Notes).

References. The student will find excellent bibliographies in F. M. Padelford's Early Sixteenth Century Lyrics (pp. 149–154); Erskine's Elizabethan Lyric (pp. 325–329), Schelling's English Lyric (pp. 311–313), and the Camb. Hist. of Eng. Lit. (vol. II, p. 550 ff.; vol. III, for Chaps. VIII, X, XI, XII, XIII; vol. IV, for Chap. VI). We give here only a few of the titles of the more important specific investigations: R. M. Alden, The Sonnets of Shakespeare, Variorum Edition, with bibliography (N.Y.: 1916); R. Alscher, Sir Thomas Wyatt und seine Stellung in der Entwickelungsgeschichte der englischen Litteratur und

Verskunst (1886); Anon., The Elizabethan Lyric (in *Quart. Rev.*, Oct., 1902); Anon., The Pléiade and the Elizabethans (in *Edinb. Rev.*, April, 1907); W. A. Barrett, English Glee and Madrigal Writers (Lond.: 1877), to which the student of the madrigal may add the references to Cox, Oliphant, etc. given below, the articles on the madrigal in the Encyc. Brit. and the great French and German encyclopedias, pp. liv-lvii of the Introd. to Schelling's Elizabethan Lyrics and the bibliography appended, pp. 349–350 of Einstein's Italian Renaissance in England and bibliography appended, Schipper's Englische Metrik (2: 887), K. Vossler's Das deutsche Madrigal (in Schick und Waldberg's *Literarh. Forsch.* 6, Weimar: 1898), Körting, Gröber, etc.; H. C. Beeching, Introd. to his Sonnets of Shakespeare (Boston: 1904); H. A. Beers, see above, § 5; W. Bolle, Die gedruckten englischen Liederbücher bis 1600, — history and texts — important (in *Palaestra*, No. 29. 1903); P. Borghesi, Petrarch and his Influence on English Literature (Bologna: 1896); A. H. Bullen, introductions to his four collections of Elizabethan lyrics, and to his Shorter Elizabethan Poems (Arber-Seccombe); F. I. Carpenter, English Lyric Poetry, see above, § 5; R. H. Case, English Epithalamies, see above, § 5; E. K. Chambers, English Pastorals, Introd. (Lond.: 1895); W. Chappell, Some Account of an Unpublished Collection of Songs and Ballads by King Henry VIII. and his Contemporaries (in *Archaeologia*, 41: 371); by the same, A Collection of National English Airs (Lond.: 1838–1840), and Popular Music of the Olden Time (Lond.: 1855–1859; new ed., entitled Old English Popular Music, Lond.: 1893); H. H. Child, Elizabethan Lyric (Chap. VIII, cf. Chap. XIII, of Camb. Hist. Eng. Lit., vol. III, 1909); by the same, The Song-Books and Miscellanies of the sixteenth century and first half of the seventeenth century (*op. cit.*, vol. IV, Chap. VI; with excellent bibliography of the Song-Books); H. E. Cory, The Critics of Edmund Spenser (*Univ. of Calif. Pubs. in Modern Philology*, vol. II, No. II, 1911); W. J. Courthope, Spenser (Chap. XI of Camb. Hist. Eng. Lit., vol. III, 1909); F. A. Cox, English Madrigals in the Time of Shakespeare (Lond.: n.d.); G. L. Craik, Spenser and his Poetry (new ed., 3 vols., Lond.: 1871); J. W. Cunliffe, Gascoigne (Chap. X of Camb. Hist. Eng. Lit., vol. III, 1909); E. Dowden, The Sonnets of William Shakespeare (Lond.: 1881); L. De Marchi, L' influenza della lirica italiana sulla lirica inglese nel secolo XVI (in *Nuova antologia*, S. III, 58. 1895; cf. *Giorn. st.*, 27. 1895); L. Einstein, The Italian Renaissance in England (N.Y.: 1902); H. Fehse, Henry Howard, Earl of Surrey. Ein Beitrag zur Gesch. des Petrarchismus in England (Progr., Chemnitz: 1883); J. B. Fletcher, The Religion of Beauty in Women (1911);

E. Flügel, Liedersammlungen des XVI. Jahrhs. besonders aus der Zeit Heinrichs VIII., — important texts (in *Anglia*, 12: 225, 585. 1889, and 26. 1903; continued by Padelford, 31: 309. 1908; cf. W. Bolle, 34: 273. 1911); also his Die handschriftliche Ueberlieferung der Gedichte von Sir Thomas Wyatt (in *Anglia*, 17, 18), and his Neuenglisches Lesebuch (Halle: 1895); A. K. Foxwell, A Study of Sir Thomas Wyatt's Poems (Lond.: 1912); L. Fränkel, Shakespeare und das Tagelied (Hannover: 1893); W. W. Greg, Pastoral Poetry and Pastoral Drama (1906); J. Guggenheim, Quellenstudien zu Samuel Daniels Sonetten Cyclus Delia (Berlin: 1898); J. S. Harrison, Platonism in English Poetry of the 16th and 17th Centuries (N.Y.: 1903); W. Hazlitt, Lects. on the Lit. of the Age of Elizabeth, Lect. VI (1820); W. C. Hazlitt, Remains of Early Popular Poetry (Lond.: 1856); H. Helm, Zur Entstehung von P. Sidneys Sonetten (in *Anglia*, 19: 549. 1897); T. F. Henderson, Scottish Popular Poetry before Burns (Chap. XIV of Camb. Hist. Eng. Lit., vol. IX, 1913; see the valuable bibliographical appendix); W. Hertzberg, Eine griechische Quelle zu Shakespeares Sonetten (in *Shaksp.-Jhb.*, XIII, 1878); O. Hoffmann, Studien zu Alexander Montgomerie (in *Engl. Studien*, 20. 1895); H. Isaac, Wie weit geht die Abhängigkeit Shakspere's von Daniel als Lyriker (in *Shaksp.-Jhb.*, 17); V. Jackson, English Melodies from the 13th to the 18th Century (Lond.: 1910); L. E. Kastner, Articles in *Mod. Lang. Rev.*, 1907–09, as cited in Camb. Hist. Eng. Lit., vol. III, p. 593; E. Koeppel, Sir Thomas Wyatt und Melin de Saint-Gelais (in *Anglia*, 13: 77. 1891); by the same, Studien zur Geschichte des englischen Petrarchismus im XVI. Jahrh. (in *Roman. Forsch.*, 5. 1890); S. Lee, Introduction to his Elizabethan Sonnets (Arber-Seccombe); by the same, The French Renaissance in England (1910), — for influence of the Pléiade, see pp. 217–219; by the same, The Sonnet (in Camb. Hist. Eng. Lit., vol. III, 1909); by the same, Chapman's "Amorous Zodiacke" (in *Mod. Philol.*, Oct. 1905); by the same, Life of W. Shakespeare (Chap. VII and Appendixes IX, X: 5th ed. 1905); by the same, Shakespeare's Sonnets, Introd. (Oxford: 1905); C. Lentzner, Über das Sonett und seine Gestaltung in der englischen Dichtung bis Milton (Halle: 1886); L. F. Mott, The System of Courtly Love (Boston: 1896); E. W. Naylor, An Elizabethan Virginal Book (Lond.: 1905), — Elizabethan music; J. A. Noble, see above, § 5; T. Oliphant, A Short Account of Madrigals (1836); by the same, La Musa Madrigalesca (Lond.: 1837); D. E. Owen, Relations of the Elizabethan Sonnet Sequences to Earlier English Verse, especially that of Chaucer (Pennsylvania Thesis, privately printed, 1903); F. M. Padelford, Early

Sixteenth Century Lyrics, Introd. (Boston: 1907), and his reprint of the manuscript poems of the Earl of Surrey (in *Anglia*, 29: 273. 1906; cf. 29: 256); also his edition of songs in MS. Selden B. 26 (in *Anglia*, 36: 79. 1912), and his Spenser's Fowre Hymnes (in *Jr. Eng. and Germ. Philol.*, vol. 13, No. 3. 1914), — a study with reference to the mystical doctrines of romantic love (cf. J. B. Fletcher in *P. M. L. A.* 19: 452; Padelford in *Mod. Philol.* 13, No. 1); M. Piéri, as cited above, § 5; E. B. Reed, The 16th Century Lyrics in Ad. MS. 18, 752 — text (in *Anglia*, 33: 344. 1910); E. F. Rimbault, Bibliotheca Madrigaliana, A Bibliographical Account of the Musical and Poetical Works published in England during the 16th and 17th Centuries (Lond.: 1847), and his Little Book of Songs and Ballads (Lond.: 1851); J. Ritson, A Select Collection of English Songs (Lond.: 1783), and his Ancient Songs and Ballads (ed. Hazlitt, Lond.: 1877); F. E. Schelling, A Book of Elizabethan Lyrics, Introd. (Boston: 1895); by the same, Life and Writings of George Gascoigne (Univ. of Pennsylvania: 1893); M. A. Scott, Elizabethan Translations from the Italian (in *Mod. Lang. Ass.*, 10–14. 1896–99); C. Segrè, Due Petrarchisti inglesi del sec. XVI (in *N. Antol.*, 175. 1901); W. E. Simonds, Wyatt and his Poems (Boston: 1889); E. Stengel, on Shakespeare's sonnets (in *Englische Studien*, 4: 1. 1881); J. A. Symonds, In the Key of Blue and other Prose Essays (Lond.: 1893); A. H. Upham, The French Influence in English Literature (N. Y.: 1908), Chap. III, The Elizabethan Sonnet; Chap. IX, French Influence on English *vers de société* from 1558 to 1660; H. Vaganay, cited above, § 5; E. Walker, The History of Music in England, Chap. IV (Oxford: 1907); K. Windscheid, Die englische Hirtendichtung von 1579 bis 1625 (Halle: 1895); I. Zocco, Petrarchismo è Petrarchisti in Inghilterra (Palermo: 1906). Of minor importance are: Mrs. M. F. Crow, Elizabethan Sonnet Cycles (2 vols. Chicago: 1896; 4 vols. Lond.: 1896–1898), — popular, no research; A. Cruse, The Elizabethan Lyrists and their Poetry (Lond.: 1913), — merely descriptive.

For bibliography of works on Petrarch, see above, VIII, D.

D. *The Seventeenth Century.*

For general *introductions*, see Schelling's English Lyric, and the appropriate chapters in the Camb. Hist. of Eng. Lit.; W. J. Courthope's History of English Poetry, vol. III; also the Introductions to the works of Saintsbury and Schelling mentioned below. — For *anthologies*, see Schelling, *op. cit.*, pp. 313–315, 316–317; for the Scotch collections of Ramsay and Watson, see below, under E.

Generally speaking, the seventeenth century saw a gradual but glorious decline of the lyric. First should be noted the poets (such as Jonson, Daniel, Drayton, Donne, Campion, etc.) who in one way or another carried modified Elizabethan strains into Jacobean poetry. The relation of the Spensereans, the Fletchers, Drummond of Hawthornden, Wither, Sir John Davies, Browne, Quarles, Joseph Beaumont, and the youthful Milton to their masters; Jonson's clarifying, classicizing influence, and Donne's deepening of the content of the Elizabethan conceit; Drayton's Elizabethan freshness carried over into short-lined lyric — ode, pastoral, and elegy — suggest lines of research that lead backward and forward, in the course of which the majority of the lyrists of the century will be encountered. The Jacobean and Caroline Miscellanies (Garlands, Drolleries, etc.) continue the Elizabethan collections of a like kind, and offer a rich field for investigation.

Among the movements which distinguish the Caroline lyric may be studied, first, the later flowering of the Petrarchan influence that had inspired Spenser, Sidney, and the Fletchers, in Habington, Quarles, Thomas Stanley, and Lovelace. As opposed to that influence with its ecstasy and adoration of chivalric love and its rapturous idealism, the courtly gallantry of the Cavalier lyric presents two phases worthy of careful historical examination: the realism that derives from the classical restraint of Jonson and the study of Anacreon, Horace, and Catullus and shows itself best in the thought, imaginative quality, and delicate art of such lyrists as Herrick, Carew, and Waller; the lawless and fantastic experimentation that derives from the 'metaphysical' influence of Donne and displays itself best in the sometimes sensuous, sometimes *spirituelle*, but always easy and musical lyrics of Suckling. The sacred lyric also presents a field for historical study; and here again may be traced the influence of Donne in the consciously artistic and ingenious, frequently 'conceited' beauties of Herbert and Vaughan. On the other hand, in Crashaw the classical spirit as well calls for attention, and the frequent use of Spanish and Italian models. The earlier lyrics of Milton and their relation to the movements mentioned above still afford material for consideration; also his cultivation and mastery of the sonnet in spite of the fact that the Elizabethan impulse had died of inanition or of the opposing influence of Jonson and Donne.

Most important in the history of metrical forms are the gradual refinement during the century of the decasyllabic couplet — adumbrated earlier by Fairfax, advocated and practised by Drayton, Sir John Beaumont, and Sandys, carried to perfection by Waller, Denham, and Cowley; the short-lived lyric of Drayton, and his experiments as well as those of Marvell in the Anacreontic or Horatian ode; the graceful and varied stanzaic forms of the cavalier lyrists, even of the less-known, Kynaston, Thomas Stanley, Henry King, the matchless Orinda (Katherine Philips).

The development of the Pindaric fad, at the hands of Jonson, Cowley, Dryden, and others, offers an excellent opportunity for analysis of the rise, growth, and decay of a formal literary fashion. Only an exact analysis of themes, diction, and metrical forms, and of the definite contribution of individual poets, such as has not yet been made, can supply us with an exhaustive review of facts by induction from which the laws of literary fashion may be formulated. — The lyric treatment of the countryside by such poets as Drayton, Marvell, Vaughan, and Milton deserves separate study; as also do the style and method of the street-ballads which played so lively a part in the controversial activities of the century.

The Restoration lyric (Dorset, Rochester, Sedley, and others) involved certain further modifications of style, themes, and "numbers," the causes of which, general and particular, have been inquired into not seldom, but seldom systematically. The student of *vers de société* will find that the Restoration lyric looms large in his field, and that he must follow certain influences back through the 'metaphysicals' and earlier poets before he can arrive at origins. This is a fascinating study, but there is as yet no orderly and exhaustive monograph on the subject, though several pleasant and suggestive asides have been uttered (see above, § 1, IV, 1). — The tyranny of the heroic couplet and the artificiality of the

Pindaric ode, both restrictive of genuine lyric, under Dryden and his followers, bring us to the end of the century.

Palgrave's summary of the second book of the Golden Treasury is as follows:

> This division, embracing generally the latter eighty years of the Seventeenth century, contains the close of our Early poetical style and the commencement of the Modern. In Dryden we see the first master of the new: in Milton, whose genius dominates here as Shakespeare's in the former book, — the crown and consummation of the early period. Their splendid Odes are far in advance of any prior attempts, Spenser's excepted: they exhibit that wider and grander range which years and experience and the struggles of the time conferred on Poetry. Our Muses now give expression to political feeling, to religious thought, to a high philosophic statesmanship in writers such as Marvell, Herbert, and Wotton: whilst in Marvell and Milton, again, we find noble attempts, hitherto rare in our literature, at pure description of nature, destined in our own age to be continued and equalled. Meanwhile the poetry of simple passion, although before 1660 often deformed by verbal fancies and conceits of thought, and afterwards by levity and an artificial tone, — produced in Herrick and Waller some charming pieces of more finished art than the Elizabethan: until in the courtly compliments of Sedley, it seems to exhaust itself, and lie almost dormant for the hundred years between the days of Wither and Suckling and the days of Burns and Cowper. — That the change from our early style to the modern brought with it at first a loss of nature and simplicity is undeniable: yet the bolder and wider scope which Poetry took between 1620 and 1700, and the successful efforts then made to gain greater clearness in expression, in their results have been no slight compensation.

References. For extended bibliographies, see appendixes of Camb. Hist. Eng. Lit., vols. IV, VII, VIII. For writers, schools, and forms: Anon., John Donne and his Contemporaries (in *Quart. Rev.*, CXCII); A. H. Bullen, Introd. to his England's Helicon (1887); F. I. Carpenter, as noted above; H. H. Child, The Song-Books, etc. (see above, under previous century); by the same, Robert Southwell, Samuel Daniel (Chap. VII of Camb. Hist. Eng. Lit., vol. IV); by the same, Drayton (*op. cit.*, Chap. X); H. E. Cory, Browne's Britannia's Pastorals and Spenser's Faerie Queene (in *Univ. of Calif. Chronicle*, April 1911); also his Spenser, The School of the Fletchers, and Milton (*Univ. Calif. Pubs. Mod. Philol.*, vol. II, No. 5, 1912); F. Delattre, Robert Herrick, etc. (Paris: 1912); E. Dowden, The Poetry of John Donne (in *Fortn.*

Rev., N.S., XLVII); O. Elton, Michael Drayton (*Spenser Soc.*, 1895; second ed. enlarged and revised, 1905); R. Garnett, The Age of Dryden (1895); E. Gosse, The Jacobean Poets (1894); the same, Seventeenth Century Studies (1883); Gosse, The Poetry of John Donne (in *New Rev.*, IX); J. C. Grierson, Donne (Chap. XI of Camb. Hist. Eng. Lit., vol. IV); J. H. Hanford, The Pastoral Elegy and Milton's Lycidas (*Pubs. Mod. Lang. Ass. of America*, N.S. vol. XVIII, No. 3, 1910); A. von der Heide, Das Naturgefühl in der englischen Dichtung im Zeitalter Miltons (*Anglistische Forschungen*, No. 45. 1915); J. S. Harrison, Platonism in English Poetry of the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries (N.Y.: 1903); T. F. Henderson, Scottish Popular Poetry (cited above, under sixteenth century); F. E. Hutchinson, The Sacred Poets (in vol. VII of Camb. Hist. Eng. Lit., 1911); A. G. Hyde, George Herbert and his Times (1905); W. F. Melton, The Rhetoric of John Donne's Verse (Baltimore: 1906); W. Minto, John Donne (in *Nineteenth Cent.*, VII); F. W. Moorman, The Cavalier Lyrists (in vol. VII of Camb. Hist. Eng. Lit., 1911); by the same, William Browne, and the Pastoral Poetry of the Elizabethan Age (Strassburg: 1897); by the same, Robert Herrick, etc. (1910); G. H. Palmer, The Works of George Herbert (Boston: 1905); G. Saintsbury, Seventeenth Century Lyrics, Introd. (1892); by the same, Lesser Caroline Poets, Milton (being Chaps. IV and V of vol. VII of the Camb. Hist. Eng. Lit.); by the same, Prosody of the Seventeenth Century (Chap. IX of Camb. Hist. Eng. Lit., vol. VIII); H. de Sélincourt, Successors of Spenser (Chap. IX of Camb. Hist. Eng. Lit., vol. IV); F. E. Schelling, Ben Jonson and the Classical School (in *Mod. Lang. Ass.*, 1898); by the same, A Book of Seventeenth Century Lyrics, Introd. (Boston: 1899); L. Stephen, John Donne (in *Nat. Rev.*, XXXIV); A. Symons, John Donne (in *Fortn. Rev.*, N.S., LXVI); A. H. Thompson, Writers of the Couplet — Cowley (Chap. III of Camb. Hist. Eng. Lit., vol. VII); A. H. Upham, as above; S. P. Vivian, Thomas Campion (Chap. VIII of Camb. Hist. Eng. Lit., vol. IV); A. W. Ward, Dryden (Chap. I of Camb. Hist. Eng. Lit., vol. VIII, 1912); C. Whibley, The Court Poets (Chap. VIII of Camb. Hist. Eng. Lit., vol. VIII. 1912); K. Windscheid (as cited above).

E. *The Eighteenth Century.*

General *introductions* are meagre, owing partly to the meagreness of lyrical materials in this century, partly to a disinclination to learn from negative conditions. See Schelling's English Lyric, Chap. V, the appropriate chapters in the Camb. Hist. Eng. Lit., vols. IX, X, XI, and the various histories of English literature cited in the Appendix.

Anthologies, naturally, are few: R. Dodsley, A Collection of Poems by Several Hands (6 vols., 1758); A. Dyce, Specimens of British Poetesses (1827); M. Lynn, A Collection of Eighteenth Century Verse (N.Y.: 1907); G. Pearch, A Collection of Poems, consisting of Valuable Pieces not inserted in Mr. Dodsley's Collection or published since (4 vols., 1775); and the general collections of Anderson, Bell, Chalmers. For Scottish poems of this and previous centuries, see: Caw, Poetical Museum (Hawick: 1784); Chambers, Miscellany of Popular Scottish Songs (Edinb.: 1841); also his Popular Rhymes of Scotland (1826), Scottish Songs (1829), and Songs of Scotland prior to Burns (1880); Allan Cunningham, Songs of Scotland (4 vols. Edinb.: 1825); Dixon, Edinburgh Book of Scottish Verse (Edinb.: 1890); Johnson, The Scots Musical Museum (6 vols. Edinb.: 1833); A. Ramsay, The Tea-Table Miscellany (1719), and The Evergreen (1724), — see the reprint in 4 vols. (Glasgow: 1876); Ritson, Scottish Songs (Edinb.: 1794); Watson, Choice Collection of Scots Poems (3 pts., 1706–11; reprinted in one vol., Glasgow: 1869); Scottish Poetry of the Eighteenth Century (Abbotsford Series, 2 vols., Glasg.: 1896); Hogg, Jacobite Relics of Scotland (1819–21); Mackay, Jacobite Songs and Ballads of Scotland (1861).

Much light may be thrown upon the nature of the lyric and its laws of development by contrasting the intellectual and emotional tendencies of the earlier with those of the middle and later parts of the eighteenth century; for under the influence of the earlier tendencies the lyric is at low ebb, but toward the middle of the century it begins to rise again, and by the end it is in full tide of new vigor and inspiration. The student will naturally inquire what influences were common to the successive periods, what peculiar to each; and to the differences discovered he will endeavor to relate the nature of the lyric and the conditions of its growth and decay. The changing temper in philosophy, religion, antiquarian research, science, political and social activity, were registered in the lyric as atmospheric variations are indicated in a barometer.

The study of Steele and Addison, though these writers are of slight importance in the history of the lyric itself, is an indispensable preliminary to an understanding of ~~the spirit of~~ the new century. It reveals the increasing assertiveness of the Puritan middle class in commerce, culture, and social reform, the transfer of literary authority from court to coffee-house, the adoption of a more serious view of life, a movement toward independence of thought, toward order and proportion in morals, manners, literature, and religion as opposed to the extravagant imagination and erotic fervor of the preceding age, a closer attention to the detail of ordinary life, to the romance and pathos of the lower class and of its womankind, a substitution in literary style of the personal and colloquial for the conventional image and phrase. The student will observe, however, that with all this charm of simplicity and of tendency to appreciate the commonplace, there continues an objectiveness of attitude, a certain incompleteness of sympathy, an inherited aloofness from nature and the heart. To the conditions necessary for a revival of the lyric in its emotional vigor and originality, and in freshness of invention, he will at the same time find that the sentimentality, enlightened conscience, and spiritual struggles of Steele, and Addison's admiration for the sublimity and morality of Paradise Lost and his vindication of the "pleasures of the imagination," contributed much, though indirectly; and that the keen insight into the life of the social individual, the lucidity and correctness of expression with which Pope carried the classical spirit and form of verse to its highest point of perfection in England, were preparing the way for a poetry more highly colored and more intimately concerned with the presence of nature, with personal impression, and spiritual prompting. The indebtedness of the masterpieces of the coming romantic lyric to the proportion, lucidity, and correctness of these three refiners of style may well occupy the attention of the investigator.

In poetry of the lyric strain, the earlier period may be said to run to the death of Thomson in 1748. Material for research is offered in the development of at least four kinds: familiar verse, the ode, the lyric descriptive of nature, the elegy. Of trifling or familiar verse, *vers de société*, Prior is the first English master. His graceful employment of the octosyllabic couplet and the recurring anapaest, and his influence upon succeeding writers, suggest a subject of study. In connection with his *vers de société* may be considered that of Lady Winchelsea, Swift, and Gay, and the so-called 'new versification' of Ambrose Philips (the trochaic tetrameter catalectic, which, however, had been frequently used before, as by Jonson, Fletcher, and Wither). In the history of the ode, Prior again is representative, and Thomas Parnell. To the lyric descriptive of nature it is well known that Lady Winchelsea made some early sentimental contribution; but not sufficient attention has been paid to the much keener and more appreciative observation of Dyer, as early as 1726, in his Grongar Hill. In the history of elegy the services of Parnell deserve attention, and his influence on Goldsmith, Blair, and Gray. The poetry of Thomson has, of late, been the subject of several scholarly treatises, to which reference is made below. They cover the quality of his rural descriptions, his relation to the reminiscential and pictorial tradition and conventional diction of Milton, and to the allegory, rhythm, phrase, and color of Spenser. The bearing of Thomson's Seasons upon the nascent lyric of nature deserves closer scrutiny than has been so far accorded.

In the second or transitional period, beginning about 1742 with Gray's studies for the enrichment of poetic diction — by ancient revival, foreign derivative, and new-coined word — and extending to the time of his death, 1771, the lyric gains the varied impetus which in the next succeeding periods produced the fully developed romantic type. Here the student will note the influence of Thomson upon Gray and Collins; Gray's introduction into lyric poetry of the more subjective and emotional communion with nature and a perception of the romantic in its changing aspects; the influence of his Norse and other medieval studies upon his poetry and that of others; the spirit of meditation and of melancholy — the elegiac mood of Gray, Blair, and Young; the combination of sublimity and restraint in the best odes of Collins, and a touch with nature more intimate and inspiring than that of Gray; also in the ode, the occasional rapture of Joseph Warton and Christopher Smart; Goldsmith's contribution to the general history of the lyric, in human sympathy, personal note, and simplicity; and the effect of Akenside's moralizing Pleasures of the Imagination. He will note the influence of the Gothic revival, — of the publication of Macpherson's Ossian, Percy's Reliques, and Walpole's Castle of Otranto. Within this period the revival of the sonnet by the Warton brothers, Wm. Mason, Bowles, and others affords material for investigation. The study of hymnology also calls for more minute attention than has been given it; and to this subject the Divine and Moral Songs, the Horae Lyricae, and Hymns of Watts, and the hymns of Simon Brown, Keach, Anne Steele, and Stennett, of Cowper and John Newton, of Doddridge, of Toplady, and of John and Charles Wesley, will afford an approach.

The last quarter of the century offers more problems in the history of the lyric than can here be summarized. We are in the gaining current of the romantic movement. Warton's History of English Poetry and Tyrwhitt's edition of Chaucer (revelatory of that poet's genius and musical form) had just appeared; and Chatterton's Rowley Poems were published in 1777, — events of moment to the investigator of influences. The relation of Crabbe and Cowper to the history of the lyric is of especial interest. Crabbe, though not a lyric poet, is of related moment for his vital appreciation in The Village (1783) and subsequent poems of the actualities of life, even that of the lower class, and for his mastery of unhackneyed imagery, — characteristics which appear to have little in common with the extravagance and the inspiration of romanticism, but still, breaking with conventional tradition, bear upon later developments in lyric art. Cowper is noteworthy for his escape, in The Task (1785), etc., from the "genteel style," for his inauguration of a 'new manner,' spontaneous, unaffectedly terse and simple, for his sense of the Divine presence in human affairs and in nature alike; and consequently for his reverent and loving observation of nature, and his emphasis upon the personal impression toward which a few from Dyer to Gray and Goldsmith had been trending. In the Poetical Sketches of

Blake (1783) and the Songs of Innocence, and of Experience (1789, 1794), the student hears again the strain of the new lyric, spontaneous and unalloyed, and he will be prompted to follow the echoes, Ossianic, Elizabethan, and other, to their origin. Burns appears (1786), and back of him is a line of fresh Scottish lyrism to be explored, — the work represented by such repositories as Caw's Poetical Museum, Watson's Choice Collection, The Tea-Table Miscellany, Ritson's Scottish Songs, and the individual poems of Ramsay and his followers, Pinnecuick, Alexander Ross, John Skinner, Lady Anne Barnard, Jean Adams, Jane Elliot, Robert Fergusson, — partly with a view to determining the relation of Burns to it, partly for the purpose of investigating its own development. Among the immediate followers of Burns — Hogg, Joanna Baillie, Lady Nairne, Allan Cunningham, Tannahill, Motherwell, Thom, and others present a field too little explored.

The lyric of the last years of this century cannot be separated from the efflorescence of the romantic movement of the early nineteenth. The influence of Bowles on Coleridge is an example of what is a commonplace in literary evolution, — the great effect of a small variation when the latter is caught up by genius. The publication of the Lyrical Ballads by Coleridge and Wordsworth in 1798, the formal opening of a new age of the lyric, suggests research into the history of those conventions of poetic subject and diction against which it was a protest. A comparative study of the relation of conventionalized diction to the lyric, in both ancient and modern times, is a desideratum. — The German and French influences that entered English literature at the close of the century also demand attention. See, for suggestions and sources, Gayley and Scott, § 21, B, the references which follow, below, and the bibliographies appended to the Camb. Hist. Lit.

Palgrave says of this century:

> It is more difficult to characterize the English Poetry of the Eighteenth century than that of any other. For it was an age not only of spontaneous transition, but of bold experiment: it includes not only such absolute contrasts as distinguish the 'Rape of the Lock' from the 'Parish

Register,' but such vast contemporaneous differences as lie between Pope and Collins, Burns and Cowper. Yet we may clearly trace three leading moods or tendencies: — the aspects of courtly or educated life represented by Pope and carried to exhaustion by his followers; the poetry of Nature and of Man, viewed through a cultivated, and at the same time an impassioned frame of mind by Collins and Gray: — lastly, the study of vivid and simple narrative, including natural description, begun by Gay and Thomson, pursued by Burns and others in the north, and established in England by Goldsmith, Percy, Crabbe, and Cowper. Great varieties in style accompanied these diversities in aim: poets could not always distinguish the manner suitable for subjects so far apart: and the union of conventional and of common language, exhibited most conspicuously by Burns, has given a tone to the poetry of that century which is better explained by reference to its historical origin than by naming it artificial. There is, again, a nobleness of thought, a courageous aim at high and, in a strict sense manly, excellence in many of the writers: — nor can that period be justly termed tame and wanting in originality, which produced poems such as Pope's Satires, Gray's Odes and Elegy, the ballads of Gay and Carey, the songs of Burns and Cowper. In truth Poetry at this, as in all times, was a more or less unconscious mirror of the genius of the age: and the many complex causes which made the Eighteenth century the turning-time in modern European civilization are also more or less reflected in its verse. An intelligent reader will find the influence of Newton as markedly in the poems of Pope, as of Elizabeth in the plays of Shakespeare. On this great subject, however, these indications must here be sufficient (Golden Treasury: Notes).

References. See, especially, Schelling, *op. cit.*, pp. 315–316; and Camb. Hist. Eng. Lit., vol. IX, appendixes to Chaps. III, VI, XIV, and vol. X, appendixes to Chaps. V, VI, VII, X, where will be found, also, mention of the best bibliographies of the respective poets. — J. Aiken, as noted above, § 3, and his Essay on Thomson's Seasons (1778); Lucy Aikin, Life of Addison (2 vols., 1843; review by Macaulay, *Edinb. Rev.*, July, 1843); G. A. Aitken, Life of Steele (2 vols. 1889), Matthew Prior (*Contemp. Rev.*, May 1890); A. Ainger, Crabbe (E. M. L. 1903), and Burns, Cowper, etc. in Lects. and Essays (vol. I. 1905); A. Angellier, Robert Burns: la vie et les œuvres (2 vols. Paris: 1893), — "a work of definitive scholarship: the most distinguished study of the poet that has been produced"; W. C. Angus, The Printed Works of R. Burns (Glasgow: 1899), — cf. other bibliogs. of Burns and works upon him, by J. C. Ewing (1899) and J. M'Kie (1881), cited in Camb. Hist. Eng. Lit., XI, 479; M. Arnold, Essay on Gray (in Ward's Eng. Poets, vol. III, 1880); W. Bayne, James Thomson (Famous Scots Series, Edinb.: 1898); H. C. Beeching, Blake's Religious Lyrics, in Essays and Studies by Members of the English Association (vol. III. 1912); H. A. Beers, A History of English Romanticism in the Eighteenth Century (N.Y.: 1899); A. Beljame, Le public et les hommes de lettres en Angleterre au dix-huitième siècle (Paris: 1881); F. Benoit, Un Maître de l'art, Blake le visionnaire (Lille: 1906); E. Bensley, Pope (Camb. Hist. Eng. Lit., IX, 73); P. Berger, W. Blake, Mysticisme et Poésie (Paris: 1907); W. Black, Goldsmith (E. M. L., 1878); J. S. Blackie, Life of R. Burns (Great Writers Series. 1888); J. D. Borthwick, History of Scottish Song (Montreal: 1874); W. L. Bowles, Memoir of Pope (in Edition of Pope, 10 vols., 1806); by the same, The Invariable Principles of Poetry, . . . relating to Pope (1819), Two Letters to the Rt. Hon. Lord Byron (1821), and other articles as listed in Camb. Hist. Eng. Lit., IX, 500; Hugh Blair, The Works of Ossian, translated by James Macpherson (2 vols. 1765; ed. W. Sharp, Edinb.: 1896); Alois Brandl, Lenore in England (in E. Schmidt's Characteristiken, Berlin: 1896); W. C. Bronson, Poems of W. Collins (1898); S. Brooke, Studies in Poetry (Blake, etc. 1907); by the same, Theology in the English Poets (1874; 10th ed. 1907); C. Browne, Life of R. Southey (1854); R. Browning, Christopher Smart (in Parleyings with Certain People of Importance etc.); Jacob Bryant, Observations upon the Poems of Thomas Rowley (2 vols. Lond.: 1781); C. Bucke, On the Life, Writings and Genius of Akenside (1832); Robert Burns, Notes on Scottish Song (ed. J. C. Dick, Clarendon Press); T. Carlyle, Burns (*Edinb. Rev.*, Dec. 1828), and Burns in Heroes, Hero-Worship and the Heroic in History (1841); T. Casson, in Eighteenth Century Literature (Oxford: 1909); H. Child, Cowper, in Camb. Hist. Eng. Lit., vol. XI (1914), and the chap. on Crabbe in the same vol.; J. C. Collins, Essays and Studies (1895); J. Conington, The Poetry of Pope (Oxford Essays, 1858); H. E. Cory, Spenser, Thomson, and Romanticism (*Pubs. Mod. Lang. Ass'n of America*, vol. XXVI, No. 1, 1911); W. J. Courthope, The Liberal Movement in English Literature (Lond.: 1885), — especially Essay II, The Conservatism of the Eighteenth Century; by the same, Addison (E. M. L., 1884); by the same, Life of Pope (Elwin and Courthope's edition of Pope's Works, vol. V, 1889); J. Dennis, The Age of Pope (1894); by the same, The Wartons, Southey, etc., in Studies in English Literature (Lond.: 1876); by the same, Robt. Southey, etc. (Boston: 1887); T. De Quincey, Reminiscences of the Lake Poets (in Works, ed.

D. Masson, vol. II. Edinb.: 1889): *Dict. Nat. Biog.*, articles on Thomas Chatterton, and on other poets of the period; A. Dobson, Eighteenth Century Vignettes (three series, 1892–96); by the same, Richard Steele (Eng. Writers, 1888), and Matthew Prior (*New Princeton Rev.*, vol. VI, 1888), and Goldsmith (Chap. IX, Camb. Hist. Eng. Lit., vol. X, 1913) and his Life of Goldsmith (Great Writers Series, 1888); Sir George Douglas, Scottish Poetry: Drummond of Hawthornden to Fergusson (Glasgow: 1911); E. Dowden, Essays Modern and Elizabethan (1910), — treatment of Lady Winchelsea's poetry; by the same, Southey (E. M. L. 1874); for Dowden's essay on Cowper and Hayley, see *Atlantic Mo.*, July 1907; Sir Charles L. Eastlake, A History of the Gothic Revival (Lond.: 1872); G. Eliot, Worldliness and Otherworldliness: the poet Young (Essays, 2d ed. 1884); E. J. Ellis, The Real Blake (1907); O. Elton, The Augustan Ages (Edinb.: 1899); by the same, A Survey of English Lit., 1780–1830 (2 vols. Lond.: 1912); F. E. Farley, Scandinavian Influences on the English Romantic Movement (*Harvard Studies in Philol.*, No. 9, 1903); Sir W. Forbes, An Account of the Life and Writings of James Beattie (2 vols., 1824); J. Forster, Life and Adventures of Oliver Goldsmith (1848, 1877); A. C. C. Gaussen, Percy, Prelate and Poet (1908); Th. Gautier, Histoire du Romantisme (Paris: 1884); G. Gilfillan, Galleries of Lit. Portraits (1856); A. Gilchrist, Life of Blake (2 vols., 1863; new ed., 1906); Knut Gjerset, Der Einfluss von Thomson's Jahreszeiten auf die deutsch. Lit. des 18ten Jahrh. (Heidelberg: 1898); E. Gosse, Eighteenth Century Literature (Lond.: 1889); by the same, From Shakespeare to Pope (Lond.: 1889); by the same, Gossip in a Library (1891), — for Lady Winchelsea and Christopher Smart; and his Gray (E. M. L., 1882); J. W. Hales and F. J. Furnivall, edition of Percy's Folio Manuscript (3 vols., 1868); W. Hazlitt, Dryden and Pope, Gay, Swift, Young, Gray, Collins, Burns, etc. (Lectures on the English Poets, 1818; in Waller and Glover, Collected Works of Hazlitt, vol. V, 1902); by the same, Spirit of the Age (1825); H. Heine, The Romantic School (English trans. N.Y.: 1882); T. F. Henderson, Scottish Popular Poetry (as noted above, under *Sixteenth Century*), and his Scottish Vernacular Literature (3d ed., 1910), and his chap. on Burns and Lesser Scottish Verse, in Camb. Hist. Eng. Lit., vol. XI; W. E. Henley, Burns: Life, etc. (1898); G. Birkbeck Hill, Dr. Johnson: his Friends and his Critics (1878); R. Huchon, Un poète réaliste anglais (Paris: 1906), Eng. trans., G. Crabbe and his Times, by F. Clarke (1907; contains bibliog.); R. Hurd, Letters on Chivalry and Romance (1762; ed. Morley, 1911); S. Johnson, Lives of the English Poets (1779–81); R. Kassner, Die Mystik, die

Künstler und das Leben (Leipz.: 1900), — for Blake; T. E. Kebble, Life of George Crabbe (Great Writers Series, 1888); W. P. Ker, The Literary Influences of the Middle Ages (Chap. X of Camb. Hist. Eng. Lit., vol. X, 1913); J. L. Kind, Edward Young in Germany (N.Y.: 1906); C. Kingsley, Burns and his School (1880); G. L. Kittredge, Gray's Knowledge of Old Norse (in Phelps's Selections from the Poetry and Prose of Gray, Boston: 1894); M. Laing, Dissertation on Ossian's Poems (in his History of England, Lond.: 1804); Mary S. Leather, Pope as a student of Milton (*Engl. Stud.*, vol. XXV, 1898); R. Maack, Pope's Einfluss auf die Idylle, u.s.w., in Deutschland (Hamb.: 1895); G. C. Macaulay, Thomson (E. M. L., 1908); T. B. Macaulay, Critical and Miscellaneous Writings; D. Masson, Chatterton (Lond.: 1874; 1899); T. J. Matthias, Observations on the Writings and on the Character of Mr. Gray (1815); M. Meyerfeld, R. Burns, Studien zu seiner dichterischen Entwicklung (Berlin: 1899); J. H. Millar, The Mid-Eighteenth Century (Edinb.: 1892); Jacob More, Strictures, Critical and Sentimental, on Thomson's Seasons (1777); Léon Morel, James Thomson, sa vie et ses œuvres (Paris: 1895); E. P. Morton, The Spenserian Stanza in the 18th Century (*Modern Philol.*, Jan. 1913); J. Nichol, R. Burns (1882), and art. Burns in Encyc. Brit., 11th ed. (1910); J. Nichols, Literary Anecdotes of the Eighteenth Century (9 vols., 1812–15); by the same, Illustrations of the Literary History of the Eighteenth Century (vols. II and VIII, the Percy correspondence, 1848, 1858); A. Nutt, Ossian and the Ossianic Literature (1899; for bibliography etc.; see also Lowndes, Bibliographer's Manual, Pt. VI, 1861, and Camb. Hist. Eng. Lit., bibliog. to Chap. X); T. S. Omond, English Metrists in the 18th and 19th Centuries (1907); Thomas Parnell, Essay on the Different Styles of Poetry (1713); T. S. Perry, English Literature in the Eighteenth Century (1883); H. Pesta, George Crabbe (Vienna and Leipz.: 1899); W. L. Phelps, The Beginnings of the English Romantic Movement (1893); Sir Walter Raleigh, Six Essays on Johnson (1910); M. Reynolds, Poems of Anne Finch, Countess of Winchelsea (Chicago: 1903); by the same, Treatment of Nature in English Poetry between Pope and Wordsworth, Chap. II (Chicago: 1909); H. Richter, T. Chatterton (in *Wiener Beiträge z. Eng. Phil.*, No. 12. 1900); O. Ritter, Quellenstudien zu R. Burns (in *Palaestra*, No. 20. 1901); H. D. Roberts, Complete Poetical Works of Chatterton (with bibliography, biography, etc. 2 vols., 1906); H. Routh, Steele and Addison (Camb. Hist. Lit., IX, 26); C. A. Sainte-Beuve, W. Cowper, ou de la poésie domestique, in Causeries du Lundi (vol. XI, pp. 132–165. 1856); G. Saintsbury, Southey, Lesser Poets of the 18th Century, in

Camb. Hist. Eng. Lit., vol. XI, and the chapter, in the same vol., on The Prosody of the 18th Century; by the same, Essays in Eng. Lit. 1780–1860 (Crabbe, etc. 1890); T. Seccombe, The Age of Johnson (1900); T. Seccombe and G. Saintsbury, Lesser Verse Writers (Chap. VI of Camb. Hist. Eng. Lit., vol. IX, 1913); also Saintsbury, Hist. Eng. Prosody, vol. II, and his article on Young, Collins, etc. (Chap. VII of Camb. Hist. Eng. Lit., vol. X, 1913); B. de Selincourt, William Blake (1909); J. C. Shairp, On Poetic Interpretation of Nature (Edinb.: 1877), and R. Burns (E. M. L., 1879), and Aspects of Poetry (1881); W. Sichel, Matthew Prior (*Quarterly Rev.*, Oct., 1899); J. S. Smart, James Macpherson (1905); F. Stehlich, George Crabbe (Halle: 1875); Sir Leslie Stephen, History of English Thought in the 18th Century (2 vols., N.Y.: 1876); by the same, Alexander Pope (E. M. L., 1880), and Thomas Gray (D. N. B., vol. XXIII, 1890), and Johnson (E. M. L., 1878, and art. in D. N. B., vol. XXX, 1892); by the same, Hours in a Library (1892); A. T. Story, W. Blake (1893); A. C. Swinburne, William Blake (new ed., 1906); by the same, Herrick (in Studies in Prose and Verse. N.Y.: 1894); A. Symons, William Blake (1907); A. Tedeschi, Ossian, "l'Homère du Nord," en France (Mailand: 1911); C. S. Terry, The Rising of 1745 (1903), — for the Jacobite literature in general; J. Texte, Jean Jacques Rousseau and the Cosmopolitan Spirit in Literature (trans. Matthews, 1899), — on Young; W. Thomas, Le Poète Edward Young (Paris: 1901); Hamilton Thompson, Thomson and Natural Description in Poetry (Chap. V of Camb. Hist. Eng. Lit., vol. X, 1913); D. C. Tovey, Gray (Camb. Hist. Eng. Lit., X, 116); W. M. Thackeray, The English Humorists of the Eighteenth Century (1853), — "Contains some admirable characterization of the poets and poetry of the time"; S. Vukadinović, Prior in Deutschland (*Grazer Stud. zur deutsch. Philol.*, Graz: 1895); Hugh Walker, Three Centuries of Scottish Literature (2 vols., Glasg.: 1893); J. P. R. Wallis, Blake, in Camb. Hist. Eng. Lit., vol. XI; Joseph Warton, An Essay on the Genius and Writings of Pope (2 vols., 1756–1782); T. Watts-Dunton, Thomas Chatterton (Ward's Eng. Poets, vol. III); D. Wilson, Thomas Chatterton (Lond.: 1869).

F. *The Nineteenth Century.*

General *introductions* in Schelling's English Lyric, Chaps. VI–VIII, and in the histories cited in the Appendix to the present work. See also Camb. Hist. Eng. Lit., vol. XI, The Period of the French Revolution; also the remaining volumes of this series, on the Nineteenth Century (vols. XII–XIV); G. Brandes, Naturalism in England (being vol. IV of the author's Main Currents in Nineteenth Century Literature. English trans. 6 vols. N.Y.: 1901–05); Hugh Walker, The Lit. of the Victorian Era (Cambridge: 1910). Reed's English Lyrical Poetry is helpful, especially in the enumeration of recent and present-day lyrists (Chap. X The Lyric of To-day).

For *anthologies*, see Schelling, *op. cit.*, pp. 319–320; special mention may be made of A. H. Miles, The Poets and Poetry of the Century (10 vols., n.d.); C. H. Page, British Poets of the Nineteenth Century (N.Y.: 1904); T. H. Ward, English Poets, vol. IV; E. C. Stedman, A Victorian Anthology, 1837–1895 (1895); Sir Arthur Quiller-Couch, The Oxford Book of English Verse, 1250–1900, and the Oxford Book of Victorian Verse (Clarendon Press); J. Cooke, The Dublin Book of Irish Verse, 1728–1909 (Dublin and Lond.: 1909); E.M., Georgian Poetry, 1911–1912 (Lond.: 1912); W. M. Dixon, The Edinburgh Book of Scottish Verse, 1300–1900 (Edinb.: 1910); Wm. Sharp, Sonnets of the Century (1886); S. Waddington, English Sonnets by Poets of the Past, and English Sonnets by Living Poets; Hall Caine, Sonnets of Three Centuries (1882); Main's Treasury of English Sonnets; Gosse, English Odes (1883), and Wm. Sharp, Great Odes; C. Stone, Sea Songs and War Songs (Clarendon, Oxford); W. Campbell, The Oxford Book of Canadian Verse (Clarendon, Oxford). To the lyrical poetry of America, the best guide is E. C. Stedman's American Anthology (Boston and N.Y.: 1890); see also P. H. Boynton, American Poetry (N. Y.: 1918).

A list of the lyric poets, greater and less, of the first two-thirds of the century may be readily made from volumes I to VII of Miles' Collection. Vol. VII represents most of the Women Poets of the century. Vol. VIII includes Robert Bridges and Contemporary Poets; vol. IX, Poets of Humor, Society and Occasional Verse; vol. X, Sacred, Moral and Religious Verse, and an appendix of Minor English, Scottish, and Irish Poets. The essays prefatory to the selections, by well-known critics, are of great value. Of the more prominent poets of the century, Wordsworth, Coleridge, Scott, Byron, Shelley, Keats, Landor, Tennyson, the Brownings, Clough, Arnold, Rossetti, William Morris, Swinburne, admirable bibliographies (by editions, biography, reminiscences and earlier criticism, and tributes in verse) are furnished in C. H. Page's British Poets of the Nineteenth Century. To the Irish Writers of English verse of the nineteenth and preceding centuries, D. J. O'Donoghue's The Poets of Ireland (Clarendon Press) is an invaluable guide.

The following roster of lyric poets of the late nineteenth century and of to-day may prove useful: A. Austin, Jane Barlow, A. C. Benson, L. Binyon, Mathilde Blind, R. Bridges, R. Buchanan, J. Davidson,

A. Dobson, E. Dowden, E. Dowson, E. Gosse, T. Hardy, W. E. Henley, A. E. Housman, L. Housman, D. Hyde, L. Johnson, R. Kipling, A. Lang, R. Le Gallienne, 'Fiona Macleod' (William Sharp), P. B. Marston, T. J. H. Marzials, George Meredith, Mrs. Meynell, F. W. H. Myers, H. Newbolt, A. Noyes, Arthur O'Shaughnessy, Seumas O'Sullivan, C. Patmore, Emily Pfeiffer, S. Phillips, Sir Arthur Quiller-Couch, A. Mary F. Robinson-Darmesteter, T. W. Rolleston, G. W. Russell ("A. E."), R. L. Stevenson, A. Symons, F. Thompson, Katherine Tynan, W. Watson, Augusta Webster, O. Wilde, W. B. Yeats. The volume of Georgian Poetry, 1911–1912, mentioned above, includes poems by Lascelles Abercrombie, Gordon Bottomley, Rupert Brooke, G. K. Chesterton, W. H. Davies, W. de la Mare, J. Drinkwater, J. E. Flecker, W. W. Gibson, D. H. Lawrence, J. Masefield, Harold Monro, T. Sturge Moore, Ronald Ross, E. B. Sargant, Jas. Stephens, R. C. Trevelyan.

For material on these, see the concluding chapters in Schelling, Reed, and Rhys; Miles' Poets of the Century, vols. V–X; W. Archer's Poets of the Younger Generation; articles by Cornelius Weygandt in *The Sewanee Review*; Yeats' Book of Irish Verse Selected from Modern Writers; P. E. More, Shelburne Essays (especially the First Series); and various magazine articles (see Poole's Index). For war poetry of 1914–17, see J. W. Cunliffe's anthology, Poems of the Great War (N.Y.: 1917); G. H. Clarke, A Treasury of War Poetry (Boston: 1917).

The lyric poetry of the nineteenth century was an instrument of various utterance, corresponding to the multiple experiences, discoveries, achievements, and movements of the period. Romanticism and the 'renaissance of wonder' first tuned the lyre of the century; and the main aspects of romanticism — return to nature, return to the Middle Ages, melancholy and *Weltschmerz*, the last partly under German influence — and of French moral and political philosophy were all reflected in the lyric. Major and minor poets in great profusion offer a confusing wealth of material. To suggest studies in the romantic lyric of Wordsworth, Coleridge, Scott, Byron would be to carry coals to Newcastle: every periodical in modern philology, publication of a modern language association, or list of doctoral theses abounds with subjects of historical, aesthetic, and other research, and with suggestions of subjects yet unattempted. Of the quality and influence of Shelley and of Keats, of the pre-Raphaelites, Tennyson, Arnold, Browning, the same may be said. A few still unexhausted themes of thought, movement, and influence may, however, appear in the sequence of analysis presented below.

Under the Victorian Age, and afterwards, the lyric was enriched by the culminating movements of philosophical, religious, scientific, and political and social thought which distinguished the second half of the nineteenth century and characterize the life of to-day. Commercialism and the scientific spirit, with all the reactions against them, have colored the lyric. The Oxford Movement, the pre-Raphaelites, rationalism, realism, and naturalism in verse, the hedonism of the 'decadents,' the new Irish movement, have existed beside or in connection with vast economic changes, socialistic theories, theories of evolution, religious uncertainty, utilitarian philosophies and philosophies of art, empirical experimentation, and unparalleled interest in scientific and historical accuracy. — Throughout the century one great effect of the rise of new problems has been to turn the mind inward — in question and doubt and, often, pain or despair. This emphasis of the subjective and introspective has tinctured the greater part of lyric utterance. As never before the lyric has been the cry of the individual soul, — of a soul freed from its early eighteenth-century bondage to convention, then revelling for a while in a romantic freedom, only to encounter the threatening utilitarianism of a new order crudely strong in its youthful vigor and insistent in its demand that old faiths be abandoned. Through this maelstrom the individual soul has expressed itself in lyric, now of the everlasting No, sometimes of the Yea, now of some quiet escape from the century's roar, or again of empire and Anglo-Saxon, or Anglo-American, destiny, or of any one of a hundred themes.

Walker (*op. cit.*, p. 322) holds that "in its highest manifestations the English poetry of the nineteenth century is lyrical: it is often so in principle, even when it is not in form." "But this predominance of the lyric implies a development of feeling and reflection, which must have taken place at the expense of something. In point of fact, it did take place at the expense of action."

For the most part what has been done toward the study of the lyric of this confusing century consists of essays in interpretation of particular authors or movements, a few representative anthologies, brief attempts at grouping nineteenth-century poets according to their literary ancestry (sons of Wordsworth, of Milton, of the pre-Raphaelites, or of foreign forebears, etc.), or according to their main interests (empire, chivalry, beauty, nature, character, conduct, society, the spiritual, etc.), and some discursive, appreciative chapters on nineteenth-century lyrists in various histories of English literature or in monographs on the nineteenth century. What remains to be done would imply: (1) several preliminary surveys of the entire field, with a gathering of materials and preliminary classification and induction; (2) a series of monographs systematically presenting the data of lyric development in theme and style within a variety of narrow provinces, such as particular subjects, particular sub-varieties of the lyric, particular cases of cross-influence between poets or periods, particular sources and influences, and, most important of all, perhaps, particular aspects of metrical development and variations of poetic type; (3) systematic attempts at generalization within period, school, or movement, on the basis of such monographs; (4) eventually, a systematic and fully reasoned and documented account of the lyric growth of the century.

It may be noted not only that nineteenth-century criticism is sadly lacking in these desiderata, but that our critical apparatus for the earlier centuries is still far from achieving the required fullness and exactness. Indeed, in the case of even the best studied periods we have gone only so far as to provide preliminary surveys and a small number of systematic monographs.

Merely by way of suggestion it may be said that the student of periods, movements, and schools will find that the lyric from 1798 to the present day appears to pass through at least four stages. (1) In the earliest, from 1798 to 1824, the dominating characteristic is the romantic (Wordsworth, Coleridge, Southey, Scott, Hogg, Moore, Byron, Shelley, Keats); but variants appear in the social revolt of Byron, the spiritual of Shelley, the ornate romantic of Keats; in the classical and cultural flavor of Landor, Rogers, Campbell, Moore; in the Cockney school of Leigh Hunt and others. (2) The next stage is eccentric: theme, manner, and style, influenced by the masters of the romantic movement, vary with personal caprice and experiment (Beddoes, Hood, Praed, Horne, Macaulay, Mangan, Hartley Coleridge, Barnes, Hawker, Wade), or is frankly spasmodic (Bailey, Dobell, Alexander Smith). This period runs to about 1842; but several of its poets continue to write during the next decade. (3) The dominating quality of the succeeding stage is the classic-romantic. It is the period of Tennyson and the Brownings, and it runs to about 1890. The most important influences within these fifty years, besides the ornate which Tennyson handed down from Keats, and the spiritual, philosophical, and moral, in which Browning follows Shelley, — but speedily becomes himself, — are the pre-Raphaelite, deriving in part from Keats and Tennyson, in part from medieval and renaissance literatures and studies in art (beginning about 1850 with Rossetti and continuing with Morris, Swinburne, Christina Rossetti, R. W. Dixon, Thomas Woolner, J. A. Symonds, P. B. Marston, O'Shaughnessy, W. J. Dawson, James Thomson, W. B. Scott, and others); the neo-classical (Matthew Arnold, from 1853 on, Swinburne again, F. W. H. Myers, Ernest Meyers, Lewis Morris, Gosse, T. Sturge Moore, Watson, Robert Bridges); the beginnings of the Gaelic revival (perhaps dating from Mangan, about 1830, but fostered by Allingham, Sir Samuel Ferguson, Aubrey Thomas de Vere in Ireland, and by William Sharp — Fiona Macleod — in Scotland); and the hedonist or aesthetic movement, born partly of Keats and the pre-Raphaelites, partly of the aesthetics of Ruskin, Pater, Symonds (Marzials, Wilde, A. Mary F. Darmesteter, and later Le Gallienne and others). (4) The final stage is that of the poets of to-day: Kipling, Noyes, Masefield, and others in England, who would be difficult to characterize as a class; Yeats, Hyde, James Stephens, Seumas O'Sullivan, and their compatriots of the Celtic movement.

The student of the lyric in respect of its theme or manner will find suggestions in what has preceded. The lyric of philosophical, social, or religious musing may be traced through the century to the present day (from Wordsworth, Coleridge, Shelley, through the Brownings, Bailey, Tennyson, Matthew Arnold, Clough, Fitzgerald, Newman, Swinburne, F. W. H. Myers, Emily Pfeiffer, Augusta Webster, Edwin Arnold, James Thomson, Davidson, Francis Thompson, Gosse, Alice Meynell, Alfred Hayes, to Masefield, Bottomley, Drinkwater, and James Stephens); the magical or mystical lyric from Blake, Wordsworth, Coleridge, Shelley, Keats, through Tennyson, Browning, Rossetti, and Coventry Patmore, to Francis Thompson, 'Fiona Macleod,' G. W. Russell ("A. E."), Yeats, and Seumas O'Sullivan; the elegiac from Shelley through Tennyson, Arnold, Swinburne, Robert Buchanan, and P. B. Marston, to William Watson and Robert Bridges; the lyric of nature from the great romantics through Alfred Austin and others, to Monro, Ronald Ross, and Sargant; the lyric of rural life from Bloomfield, Clare, Thom, through William Barnes and Jean Ingelow, to Norman Gale, the Housmans, Masefield, and Gibson; the lyric of democracy from the romantics to Wm. Morris, E. C. Jones, Gerald Massey, Brough, and later, and of labor from Ebenezer Elliott and Eliza Cook to Mathilde Blind. And in all periods, we find the pure lyric of emotional or aesthetic appeal. — We have, too, the various revivals of the Elizabethan or the Miltonic strain, as in Alfred Austin, Watson, Bridges, Stephen Phillips, Noyes; or of the Spenserian, as in James Thomson; or of the manner of Milton, Gray, Wordsworth, as in Matthew Arnold and Watson. — *Vers de société* may be studied from Praed and Hood, through Calverley, Mortimer Collins, J. K. Stephen, Locker-Lampson, Stevenson, Lang, Gosse, Dobson, — or humorous verse, as in Hookham Frere, Canning, James and Horace Smith, Lamb, Moore, Leigh Hunt, Peacock, Hook, Barham, Lover, Lever, Thackeray, J. B. Stephens, Gilbert, Sterry,

— or nonsense verse, as in Edward Lear and 'Lewis Carroll' (C. L. Dodgson). — The lyric of realism offers itself, as in Crabbe, Henley, Masefield; of patriotic romanticism, from Campbell and Dobell to Kipling and Noyes; the song, as in Hogg, Moore, Peacock, 'Father Prout' (Francis Mahony), 'Barry Cornwall' (Bryan Waller Procter), Beddoes, Blackie, Houghton, Gerald Griffin, T. J. H. Marzials; the ballad-lyric from Motherwell, Macaulay, and Aytoun, through Tennyson and Thornbury, to Marzials, Stevenson, William Sharp, H. G. Groser, Kipling, and Masefield; the sonnet from William Lisle Bowles, the great romantics, and Joseph Blanco White, through Sir Aubrey de Vere, Hartley Coleridge, Matthew Arnold, and the Rossettis, to Dowden, Watson, P. B. Marston, Rawnsley, and the writers of to-day; the ode from Coleridge, Wordsworth, and Shelley, through Tennyson, Browning, Arnold, Swinburne, James Russell Lowell, Coventry Patmore, Bayard Taylor, to Wm. Vaughn Moody, and English and American poets of to-day; the hymn from James Montgomery, Heber, Keble, and Newman, down. — Imitations of classical metres offer themselves for study, as in Tennyson, Charles Kingsley, Clough, Robinson Ellis, Swinburne, Watson, and the present poet-laureate; and imitations of artificial French forms, as in Rossetti, Swinburne, Lang, Dobson, Gosse, Henley, and among Americans in F. D. Sherman, Clinton Scollard, and others. So too the novel experiments in verse of Robert Bridges; and the by no means novel vagaries of the writers of "free verse," who, if they disdain to derive from the psalmists and Job, might at any rate father themselves on Leigh Hunt, or the French writers of "vignettes," or Walt Whitman.

To the student of influences, of pivotal personages, or literary ancestry, abundant opportunities besides those already indicated present themselves. Let him attempt the derivation, literary, artistic, social, religious; classical, medieval, Chaucerian, renaissance, Elizabethan, Miltonic, Wordsworthian; Icelandic, Celtic, French or German or oriental; romantic, realistic, mystical — of any one of the movements characteristic of the nineteenth- or twentieth-century lyric, and problems innumerable will clamor for solution. Or let him attempt the derivation and influence (not to speak of the first English romantics and of such figures as Browning and Tennyson) of a pivotal character, such as Blake, Crabbe, Leigh Hunt, Shelley, Keats, Arnold, Rossetti, Swinburne, Fitzgerald, Oscar Wilde; or let him try to trace the literary ancestry of one or more of the later poets, — Bridges, Watson, Kipling, and Stephen Phillips, or Noyes, Masefield, Seumas O'Sullivan, and Rupert Brooke, — and the ramifications of his study will carry him along and athwart the century.

Palgrave summarizes the last book of the Golden Treasury thus:

> It proves sufficiently the lavish wealth of our own age in Poetry, that the pieces which, without conscious departure from the Standard of Excellence, render this Book by far the longest, were with very few exceptions composed during the first thirty years of the Nineteenth century. Exhaustive reasons can hardly be given for the strangely sudden appearance of individual genius: that, however, which assigns the splendid national achievements of our recent poetry to an impulse from the France of the first Republic and Empire is inadequate. The first French Revolution was rather one result, — the most conspicuous, indeed, yet itself in great measure essentially retrogressive, — of that wider and more potent spirit which through enquiry and attempt, through strength and weakness, sweeps mankind round the circles (not, as some too confidently argue, of Advance, but) of gradual Transformation: and it is to this that we must trace the literature of Modern Europe. But, without attempting discussion on the motive causes of Scott, Wordsworth, Shelley, and others, we may observe that these Poets carried to further perfection the later tendencies of the Century preceding, in simplicity of narrative, reverence for human Passion and Character in every sphere, and love of Nature for herself: — that, whilst maintaining on the whole the advances in art made since the Restoration, they renewed the half-forgotten melody and depth of tone which marked the best Elizabethan writers: — that, lastly, to what was thus inherited they added a richness in language and a variety in metre, a force and fire in narrative, a tenderness and bloom in feeling, an insight into the finer passages of the Soul and the inner meanings of the landscape, a larger sense of Humanity, — hitherto scarcely attained, and perhaps unattainable even by predecessors of not inferior individual genius. In a word, the Nation which, after the

Greeks in their glory, may fairly claim that during six centuries it has proved itself the most richly gifted of all nations for Poetry, expressed in these men the highest strength and prodigality of its nature. They interpreted the age to itself — hence the many phases of thought and style they present: — to sympathise with each, fervently and impartially, without fear and without fancifulness, is no doubtful step in the higher education of the soul. For purity in taste is absolutely proportionate to strength — and when once the mind has raised itself to grasp and to delight in excellence, those who love most will be found to love most wisely.

But the gallery which this Book offers to the reader will aid him more than any preface. It is a royal Palace of Poetry which he is invited to enter:

> Adparet domus intus, et atria longa patescunt —

though it is, indeed, to the sympathetic eye only that its treasures will be visible.

In what precedes the names of one or two American poets have been incidentally mentioned; but it is not the purpose of the authors to deal here with the American lyric. The periods and problems are different; and the student in that field is referred to the histories of American literature, to such treatises as E. C. Stedman's Poets of America, and such collections as his American Anthology and Griswold's Poets and Poetry of America.

References. The following list may be supplemented by many of the references given above, §§ 2, 5; and by the bibliographies in Page's British Poets of the Nineteenth Century, to which we are largely indebted. In general, see also the mass of Lives, and the articles in *The Atlantic Mo.*, *N. Y. Nation*, *Current Opinion*, *The Review of Reviews* (English and American), *The Literary Digest*, etc. and in the English periodicals, dealing with the poets of the last and the present century; in the last three vols. of the Camb. Hist. of Eng. Lit., the student will find ample critical apparatus for the poets up to the close of the Victorian era, and for the developments of the English lyric in India and the commonwealths beyond the seas. — R. M. Alden; English Verse (1903), — on the Sonnet, Ode, Imitations of Classical Metres and of Artificial French Lyric Forms, pp. 267–391; J. P. Anderson, Bibliography of

Lord Byron (in Noel's Life of Byron); W. Archer, Poets of the Younger Generation (Lond.: 1902), which Professor Schelling calls "to its date, the best summary of the subject"; W. J. Alexander, An Introduction to the Poetry of R. Browning; M. Arnold, Essays in Criticism (First Series, 1865; Second Series, 1888); by same, On the Study of Celtic Literature (1895); P. Aronstein, Tennysons Welt- und Lebensanschauung (in *Englische Studien*, 28: 54. 1900); A. Austin, The Bridling of Pegasus (1910), — Wordsworth and Byron, Tennyson, etc.; by the same, The Poetry of the Period (*Temple Bar*, Aug., Sept., 1869), — on Arnold and others; W. Bagehot, Literary Studies (1879), — Shelley, Wordsworth, Tennyson, and Browning; H. Beers, A History of English Romanticism in the Nineteenth Century (N.Y.: 1901); Malcolm Bell, Sir Edward Burne-Jones (1892), — on Pre-Raphaelitism; A. C. Benson, Essays (1896); by the same, Alfred Tennyson (Little Biographies, 1904), and Rossetti (E. M. L., 1904); E. Berdoe, The Browning Cyclopaedia (1892), and Browning's Message to his Time (1890); Augustine Birrell, Essays and Addresses (on Browning, etc. 1901); P. Bourget, Études et portraits (for Shelley); H. W. Boynton, The Poetry of Landor (*Atlantic*, July, 1902); A. C. Bradley, Oxford Lectures on Poetry (1909), — for Wordsworth, Shelley, Keats' Letters; G. M. C. Brandes, Shelley and Lord Byron (1894); by the same, Die Hauptströmungen d. Lit. d. 19ten Jahrh., referred to above; A. Brandl, Samuel Taylor Coleridge and the English Romantic School (Trans., Lond.: 1887); R. S. Bridges, Keats, a Critical Essay (1895); G. Brimley, Essays (1855), — Tennyson; S. A. Brooke, Four Victorian Poets — Arnold, Clough, Rossetti, Morris — with an introd. on "The Course of Poetry since 1852" (1908); by the same, Studies in Poetry (1907); by the same, Theology in the English Poets (1874), — for Coleridge, etc.; by the same, Tennyson, his Art and Relation to Modern Life (1894); by the same, The Poetry of Browning (1902); R. Browning, On the Poet, Objective and Subjective; and On Shelley as Man and Poet (1852, 1881); Browning Society Papers (of London, 1895); Browning Society Papers (of Boston, 1897); R. Buchanan, A Look about Literature (1877); by the same, The Fleshly School of Poetry (1872); Lady Burne-Jones, Memorials of Edward Burne-Jones (1904); T. Hall Caine, Coleridge (Great Writers Series, 1887); by the same, Cobwebs of Criticism (1883), — on Shelley, Keats, and others; and Recollections of Rossetti (1882); G. H. Calvert, Coleridge, Shelley, Goethe (1880); J. D. Campbell, Samuel Taylor Coleridge (1894); E. L. Cary, The Rossettis (1900); by the same, William Morris: Poet, Craftsman, Socialist (1902); T. Carlyle, Miscellanies (vol. IV, for Scott); E. Castelar, Vida de Lord Byron (1873;

Eng. trans. 1875); Charles Cestre, La Révolution française et les poètes anglais (1906); G. K. Chesterton, Tennyson (Bookman Biographies, 1904); by the same, Browning (E. M. L., 1903); by the same, Twelve Types (1902); by the same, The Victorian Age in Literature (N. Y. and Lond.: 1913); A. H. Clough, Prose Remains; E. H. Coleridge, Bibliography of Byron (in his ed. Poetical Works, vol. VII); S. T. Coleridge, Biographia Literaria; also his Table Talk, Letters, etc.; J. C. Collins, Illustrations of Tennyson (1891); by the same, Studies in Poetry and Criticism (1905), — for Byron; S. Colvin, Keats (E. M. L., 1887); by the same, Landor (E. M. L.), and Preface to his Selections from Landor (Gold. Treas. Series); Hiram Corson, Introduction to the Study of R. Browning's Poetry; W. J. Courthope, The Liberal Movement in English Literature (Lond.: 1885); J. W. Cunliffe, Elizabeth Barrett's Influence on Browning's Poetry (*Mod. Lang. Pubs.*, June, 1908); J. Darmesteter, Nouvelles études anglaises: la Révolution et Wordsworth (Paris: 1896; transl. Mary Darmesteter, in Engl. Studies, Lond.: 1896); W. H. Dawson, Matthew Arnold and his Relation to the Thought of our Time; A. De Vere, Essays, Chiefly on Poetry (1887); Thos. De Quincey, Works (Ed. D. Masson; vols. II, III, V, XI, on Wordsworth, Coleridge, Shelley, Keats, Landor, etc.); J. Devey, Comparative Estimate of Modern English Poets; Austin Dobson, Notes on some Foreign Forms of Verse (in Latter Day Lyrics, 1878); W. M. Dixon, A Primer of Tennyson (1896); by the same, English Poetry from Blake to Browning; E. Dowden, Poetical Feeling for Nature (in *Contemp. Rev.*, II, 1866), — on Wordsworth, Coleridge, etc.; by the same, Studies in Literature, 1789–1877 (1878); by the same, Transcripts and Studies (1888); also New Studies in Literature (1895), French Revolution and English Literature (1897), Life of Shelley (1886), and Browning (Temple Biogs., 1904), and Arnold (in Chambers' New Cycl. Eng. Lit., 1904); R. Dyboski, Tennysons Sprache und Stil (in *Wiener Beiträge*, No. 25. 1907); M. Eimer, Byron und der Kosmos (in *Anglistische Forsch.*, No. 34); K. Elze, Lord Byron (1870); E. Estève, Byron et le romantisme français (1907); John Forster, W. S. Landor (2 vols. 1869); H. B. Forman, The Shelley Library, an Essay in Bibliography (1886); by same, Complete Works of Shelley (8 vols., 1876–79; 1882; various important notices); by same, Complete Works of Keats (4 vols., 1883; 1889; vol. II for Leigh Hunt's articles in *The Indicator*); by same, Our Living Poets (1868), — Arnold, Morris, etc.; O. B. Frothingham, Transcendentalism in New England (1875); E. Fuller, Arnold, Newman, and Rossetti (*The Critic*, Sept., 1904); F. J. Furnivall, A Bibliography of R. Browning from 1833 to 1881; A. Galton, Two

Essays on Matthew Arnold; R. Garnett, Matthew Arnold (art. D. N. B.); L. E. Gates, Studies and Appreciations (1900), — on Tennyson, Arnold; also his Three Studies in Literature; S. F. Gingerich, Wordsworth, Tennyson, and Browning: a study in Human Freedom (1911); Th. Gautier, Histoire du Romantisme (1884), — for comparative studies, Byron, etc.; Goethe, Conversations with Eckermann (for Byron); E. Gosse, Coventry Patmore (1905); by same, A Plea for Certain Exotic Forms of Verse (in *Cornhill Mag.*, July, 1877); by the same, History of English Lit., Nineteenth Century (1906); by the same, Questions at Issue (1893); by the same, Critical Kit-Kats (1896); by the same, R. Browning; Personalia (1890); Life of Swinburne (Lond.: 1917); Guiccioli (The Countess), Lord Byron jugé par les témoins de sa vie (1868; tr. Jerningham, 1869); A. H. Hallam, Literary Remains, — on Tennyson's Lyrical Poems; Walter Hamilton, The Aesthetic Movement in England, — for Wilde and others; A. E. Hancock, The French Revolution and the English Poets (1899); by the same, John Keats (1908); J. L. Haney, Bibliography of Coleridge (1903); F. Harrison, Tennyson, Ruskin, Mill, Arnold, etc. (1899); W. Hazlitt, My First Acquaintance with Poets (in Literary Remains); by the same, The Spirit of the Age, and Lectures on the English Poets; H. Heine, Die Romantische Schule (for comparative studies); A. A. Helmholtz, The Indebtedness of Coleridge to A. W. von Schlegel (1907); W. E. Henley, Views and Reviews, Essays in Appreciation (2 vols. 1891–2); C. H. Herford, The Age of Wordsworth (1901); by the same, Browning (Mod. Eng. Writers, 1904); O. Heuser, Swinburnes Lyrik (in *Zeitschr. f. vergl. Littgesch.*, N. F., 15: 206 ff.); T. J. Hogg, Life of Shelley (1858); Lord Houghton (R. M. Milnes), Life, Letters and Literary Remains of Keats (1848, 1867); W. D. Howells, My Literary Passions (1895), — for Scott, Tennyson, and other modern poets; W. H. Hudson, Sir Walter Scott (Scots Epoch Makers, 1901); by the same, Studies in Interpretation: Keats, Clough, Arnold (1896); A. M. D. Hughes, The Nascent Mind of Shelley (in *Englische Studien*, 45: 61. 1912); Leigh Hunt, *The Seer*, 1: 204 (Wordsworth and Milton); by the same, Lord Byron and Some of his Contemporaries; by the same, Imagination and Fancy (1844); Holman Hunt, Pre-Raphaelitism and the Pre-Raphaelite Brotherhood (1905); L. Hunt and S. A. Lee, The Book of the Sonnet (with introductory Essay, 1867); R. H. Hutton, Literary Essays (1871, 1888); Essays, Theological and Literary (2 vols., Lond.: 1880), — for Wordsworth, Byron, Shelley, Tennyson, Clough, Arnold; by the same, Scott (E. M. L., 1878); by the same, Brief Literary Criticisms (1906), — for Scott, Keats, Tennyson, Browning, Clough, Arnold;

W. R. Inge, Studies of English Mystics (1906); **A. A. Jack and** A. C. Bradley, Short Bibliog. of Coleridge (Eng. Assoc., Leaflet 23, 1912); J. C. Jeaffreson, The Real Lord Byron (1883); Henry Jones, Browning as a Philosophical and Religious Teacher (1891); Francis Jeffrey, on Wordsworth's Poems (*Edinb. Rev.*, Nos. 21, 47, 50; and in his Critical Essays); also in Critical Essays, Coleridge's Literary Life, Scott's Poems, Byron's Poetry, Keats's Poetry; W. P. Ker, Wordsworth, Scott (Chambers' Cyclopaedia of Eng. Lit., 1904); by the same, Tennyson (1910); W. Knight, Life of William Wordsworth (3 vols., 1889, 1896); by the same, Studies in Philosophy (1868), and Rossetti (Great Writers, 1887); E. Koeppel, Lord Byron (1903); by the same, R. Browning (in *Litthist. Forsch.*, No. 48. 1912); A. Lang, Lays and Lyrics of Old France (1872, — for the imitation of foreign forms of verse); by the same, Sir Walter Scott (Literary Lives Series, 1906), Letters on Literature (1889), Poets' Country (1907), Alfred Tennyson (Mod. Eng. Writers, 1901), The Poetry of William Morris (articles in *Contemp. Rev.*, Aug. 1882, and *Longman's Mag.*, Oct. 1896); Lamartine, Le dernier chant de Childe Harold (1824); Vernon Lee (Violet Paget), The Rhetoric of Landor (*Contemp. Rev.*, LXXXIV. 1903); R. Le Gallienne, Attitudes and Avowals (1910); E. Legouis, La Jeunesse de William Wordsworth (1896; trans. J. W. Matthews, 1897), and the chap. on Wordsworth in Camb. Hist. Eng. Lit., vol. XI; J. G. Lockhart, Life of Sir Walter Scott (1837); by the same, Tennyson's Poems (*Quart. Rev.*, April, 1833); J. R. Lowell, Prose Works (vols. I, IV, VI, etc., on Wordsworth, Coleridge, Keats, Landor, etc.); Morton Luce, A Handbook to the Works of Tennyson (1895); J. W. Mackail, The Progress of Poesy (Oxford); also his Life of William Morris (2 vols. 1899), his William Morris and his Circle (Clarendon Press), and his Swinburne (1909); A. Mackie, Nature Knowledge in Modern Poets (1906); D. Masson, Wordsworth, Shelley, Keats and Other Essays (1874); O. Maurer, Shelley und die Frauen (in *Litthist. Forsch.*, No. 33. 1906); U. Mengin, L'Italie des Romantiques (1902), — for Byron, etc.; Alice Meynell, Swinburne's Lyrical Poetry (*Dublin Rev.*, July, 1909); E. Meynell, The Life of Francis Thompson (Lond.: 1913); A. H. Miles, Poets and Poetry of the Century, introductions (10 vols., n.d.); J. S. Mill, Dissertations and Discussions (on Coleridge, etc.); also his Autobiography (on Wordsworth); A. B. Miller, Leigh Hunt's Relations with Byron, Shelley, and Keats (1909); G. Monti, Studi critici: Leopardi e Byron (1887); T. Moore, The Letters and Journals of Lord Byron (1830; reviewed by T. B. Macaulay, 1831, — Macaulay's Essays); P. E. More, Shelburne Essays (several series, 1904 ff.), — stimulating articles on Wordsworth, Byron, Shelley, Keats, Browning, Swinburne, and other poets of the century; John Morley, Miscellanies (1871); by the same, Studies in Literature (1891); F. W. H. Myers, William Wordsworth (E. M. L., 1881); also his Essays Modern (1883), — Rossetti and the Religion of Beauty; and Wm. Morris and the Meaning of Life (*Nineteenth Cent.*, Jan. 1893); J. T. Nettleship, Essays on R. Browning's Poetry (1868); J. Nichol, Byron (E. M. L., 1880); W. R. Nicoll and T. J. Wise, Literary Anecdotes of the Nineteenth Century (1895); J. A. Noble, The Sonnet in England (1893); Roden Noel, Lord Byron (Great Writers Series, 1890); Alfred Noyes, Morris (E. M. L., 1908); D. Nisard, Portraits et études d'histoire littéraire (for Byron); W. Ochsenbein, Die Aufnahme Lord Byron's in Deutschland, u. s. w. (1905); T. S. Omond, English Metrists in the 18th and 19th Centuries (Oxford); Alexandra Orr, Life and Letters of Robert Browning (new ed. by Kenyon, 1908); by the same, A Handbook to the Works of R. Browning; F. T. Palgrave, Scott (Introd. to Globe Edition of Scott's Poetical Works); H. W. Paul, Matthew Arnold (E. M. L., 1902); W. M. Payne, The Greater English Poets of the Nineteenth Century (N. Y.: 1907), — for Wordsworth, Coleridge, Byron, Shelley, Keats, Landor, Tennyson, Browning, Rossetti, Morris, Swinburne; by the same, Introduction to his edition of Selected Poems of Swinburne (1905); W. Pater, Appreciations (Lond.: 1889), — on Wordsworth, Coleridge, Rossetti, etc.; by the same, Essays from *The Guardian* (Lond.: 1901), — on Wordsworth, Browning; T. L. Peacock, Memoirs of Percy Bysshe Shelley; T. S. Perry, Arthur Hugh Clough (*Atlantic*, 1875); F. H. Pughe, Studien über Byron und Wordsworth (*Anglistische Forschungen*, No. 8. 1902); J. T. A. Pyre, Byron in our Day (*Atlantic*, April, 1907); *Quarterly Rev.*, No. 37 (1818), Review of Endymion (by W. Gifford?); W. A. Raleigh, Wordsworth (1903); M. Reynolds, The Treatment of Nature in Eng. Poetry between Pope and Wordsworth (Chicago: 1909); Anne Thackeray Ritchie, Records of Tennyson, Ruskin, Browning (1892); F. W. Robertson, Lects. on the Influence of Poetry, and Wordsworth (1906); J. M. Robertson, New Essays toward a Critical Method (Lond.: 1897), — on Coleridge, Keats, Tennyson, Clough; É. Rod, Études sur le dix-neuvième siècle (1888), — for the Pre-Raphaelites; W. M. Rossetti (ed.), *The Germ* (1850; reprinted by T. B. Mosher, 1898); also his Ruskin, Rossetti and Pre-Raphaelitism (1899), his Pre-Raphaelite Diaries and Letters (1900), his Rossetti, Letters and Memoir (2 vols. 1895), and his Rossetti Papers (1903); by the same, Lives of Famous Poets (1878); by the same, Keats (Great Writers Series, 1887); by the same, Swinburne's Poems and Ballads (1866); J. Royce, Studies of

Good and Evil (1898), — Tennyson and Pessimism; G. W. E. Russell, Letters of Matthew Arnold (2 vols., 1895); Sainte-Beuve, Chateaubriand et son groupe littéraire (vol. I, Chap. XV. 1848), — for Byron; G. Saintsbury, Nineteenth Century Lit., 1780–1895 (1896); also, his Essays in English Literature (Second Series, 1895), — for Coleridge, Scott, Southey, Landor; his Sir Walter Scott (Famous Scots Series, 1897), his Life of Matthew Arnold (Mod. Eng. Writers, 1899), and his Corrected Impressions (1895), — for Tennyson, Browning, Arnold, Morris, Swinburne; H. S. Salt, Shelley (1896); John Sampson, Blake's Poetical Works (Oxford), — valuable bibliographical notes and prefaces; Geo. Santayana, Interpretations of Poetry and Religion (on Browning, etc.); J. Schmidt, Portraits aus d. 19ten Jahrh.: Lord Byron (1878); H. Schmitt, Shelley als Romantiker (in *Englische Studien*, 44: 32. 1912); G. Sarrazin, La Renaissance de la poésie anglaise (1887); T. Scott, A Bibliography of the Works of William Morris; Sir Walter Scott, Childe Harold's Pilgrimage (in Critical and Miscellaneous Essays); J. C. Shairp, Aspects of Poetry (Boston: 1882); by the same, Studies in Poetry of Philosophy (1868, 1887), — for Wordsworth, Coleridge; by the same, On the Poetic Interpretation of Nature (1887), — Wordsworth; by same, Portraits of Friends (A. H. Clough and others); Mrs. E. A. Sharp, William Sharp, a Memoir (1910); W. Sharp, Dante Gabriel Rossetti, a Record and a Study (1883); and his Shelley (Great Writers Series, 1887; with bibliographical Appendix by J. P. Anderson); his Life of Browning (Great Writers, 1890, with bibliog. Appendix by J. P. Anderson); his Wm. Morris, the Man and his Work (*Atlantic*, Dec. 1896); and Swinburne (*Pall Mall Mag.*, Dec. 1901); Lady Shelley, Shelley Memorials (1859); R. H. Shepherd, Bibliography of Swinburne (1887); Bibliography of Tennyson (1896); Bibliography of Coleridge (revised by Prideaux, 1909); H. Sidgwick, Miscellaneous Essays and Addresses (1905), — for Clough, Arnold; M. Simhart, Byrons Einfluss auf d. ital. Lit. (in *Münchener Beiträge*, No. 45. 1909); T. B. Smart, The Bibliography of Matthew Arnold (1892); A. Smith, The Main Tendencies of Victorian Poetry (Bournville, Birmingham: 1907); Goldwin Smith, Scott's Poetry Again (*Atlantic*, March, 1905); E. H. Sneath, Wordsworth: Poet of Nature and Poet of Man (N.Y.: 1912); James Spedding, Reviews (1843), — Tennyson; C. F. E. Spurgeon, Mysticism in English Literature (Camb.: 1913), — a stimulating and well authenticated discussion, with a bibliography of the subject; E. C. Stedman, Victorian Poets (1876); Sir Leslie Stephen, Hours in a Library (1892. vols. II, III), — for Wordsworth, Coleridge, Scott, Shelley, Landor; his Studies of a Biographer (1898); and his article on Clough (D. N. B.); S. J. M. Suddard, L'imagination de Wordsworth, Essais de litt. anglaise (Cambridge: 1912; also in English); A. Swanwick, Poets the Interpreters of their Age (Arnold, Clough, etc.); A. C. Swinburne, Miscellanies (1886), — Wordsworth and Byron, Keats, Landor, Tennyson; also his Essays and Studies (1875), — for Coleridge, Byron, Shelley, Rossetti, Morris; and his Studies in Prose and Poetry (1894), — for Scott, etc.; J. A. Symonds, Essays Speculative and Suggestive (2 vols. 1890); by same, Shelley (E. M. L., 1878); by same, Matthew Arnold's Selections from Wordsworth (*Fortn. Rev.*, 32: 686); A. Symons, Studies in Prose and Verse (1904); and his The Romantic Movement in English Poetry (1909); his essay on Coleridge (*Internat. Quart.*, June–Sept., 1904); his Was Sir Walter Scott a Poet? (*Atlantic*, Nov., 1904); his Poetry of Landor (*Atlantic*, June, 1906); and his Introduction to the Study of Browning; Hallam Tennyson, Alfred, Lord Tennyson (2 vols., 1897; one vol., 1905); Jos. Texte, Études de lit. européenne (1898), — Wordsworth et la poésie lakiste en France, Keats et le néo-hellénisme, Mrs. Browning; Francis Thompson, Shelley (1909); C. Tomlinson, The Sonnet, its Origin, Structure and Place in Poetry (1874); H. D. Trail, Coleridge (E. M. L., 1884); E. J. Trelawney, Recollections of Shelley and Byron; W. P. Trent, The Authority of Criticism (1899), — The Byron Revival, Shelley; A. Vallance, William Morris (1897); C. E. Vaughan, Coleridge (in Camb. Hist. Eng. Lit., vol. XI); S. Waddington, Arthur Hugh Clough (1883); H. Walker, The Greater Victorian Poets (1895); by the same, The Literature of the Victorian Era (Cambridge: 1910); T. H. Ward, English Poets, vol. IV (1880), — the essays by various writers on poets from Wordsworth to Dobell; T. H. Warren, Essays of Poets and Poetry, Ancient and Modern (1909), — Arnold, etc.; W. Watson, Excursions in Criticism (1893), — for Coleridge, Keats' Letters; T. Watts-Dunton, Dante Gabriel Rossetti (in Encyc. Brit., 9th ed., 1886); by the same, Byron (in Chambers' New Cycl. Eng. Lit., 1904); by the same, Tennyson as a Nature Poet, Tennyson and the Scientific Movement (*Nineteenth Century*, May, Oct., 1893); and William Morris (*Athenaeum*, Oct. 10, 1896); Arthur Waugh, Life of Tennyson (1893); C. Weygandt (for references, see Schelling's English Lyric, p. 319); S. Wheeler, Landor's Letters, Private and Public (1899, including a bibliography); Gleeson White, Ballades and Rondeaus (1893); also his Matthew Arnold and the Spirit of the Age; Lilian Whiting, A Study of E. B. Browning (1899); John Wilson, Essays (on Wordsworth, Coleridge, Tennyson); L. Winstanley, Shelley as a Nature Poet (in *Englische Studien*, 34: 17. 1904); T. J. Wise, Bibliography of

Tennyson (1908), and Bibliography of Coleridge (Bibliog. Society: 1913); E. Wood, Dante Rossetti and the Pre-Raphaelite Movement (Lond.: 1894); G. E. Woodberry, Makers of Literature (1890, 1900), — for Wordsworth, Coleridge, Byron, Shelley, Keats, Browning, Arnold; by the same, Swinburne (1905); by the same, Great Writers (1907); Christopher Wordsworth, Memoirs of Wm. Wordsworth (2 vols., 1851); W. B. Yeats, Irish Poetry, Poetry and Tradition, — two essays in vol. VIII of the author's Collected Works (8 vols., 1908); by the same, Ideas of Good and Evil (1903), — for the Philosophy of Shelley, and for Morris, the Happiest of the Poets.

G. *British Hymnody.*

On British Hymnody, see first the article on Hymns by Lord Selborne, in the Encyc. Brit. (cited above, under Early Christian Greek and Latin Hymns; published separately, under the same title, Lond.: 1892), which will at once open the field to the student. See further, Julian's Dictionary of Hymnology (Lond.: 1892), and the following: Holland's Psalmists of Britain (1843); J. Miller's Our Hymns, their Authors and Origin (1866); J. Gadsby's Memoirs of Principal Hymn-Writers, etc. (3d ed. 1861); D. Sedgwick's Comprehensive Index of Names of Original Authors of Hymns (2d ed. 1863); C. H. Herford's Literary Relations of England and Germany (pp. 8–20 Coverdale's Hymns); F. D. Huntington's Hymns of the Ages, with introduction (3 vols., Boston: 1877). An excellent small anthology of hymns, collected by R. Palmer, is published in the Golden Treasury Series (The Book of Praise, Lond.: 1898); F. T. Palgrave's Treasury of Sacred Song (Oxford: 1890) contains most of the most artistic English hymns; of the best hymns of the nineteenth century many are included in vol. X of Miles' Poets and Poetry of the Century (Lond.: n. d.). The Oxford Hymn Book and The English Hymnal (both Clarendon Press) should be consulted.

XII. **The Celtic Lyric** (Irish, Scottish, Welsh, Breton, etc.).

On the Celtic Lyric in general, see references as given in the Appendix, under Celtic Literature; especially vols. I, IX–XI of Jubainville. See also the articles on Celtic Literature (Irish, Scottish, Gaelic, Welsh, Breton, etc.) in the Encyc. Brit., 11th ed.; the section, Die Keltischen Literaturen (on the same divisions), by Kuno Meyer and L. C. Stern, in Hinneberg's Kult. d. Gegenwart, T. I, Abt. XI, I, 1909; and vols. I, IX–XI of Jubainville. Edward O'Reilly and Eugene O'Curry in Ireland, the Vicomte de la Villemarqué in France, and Thomas Stephens in Wales, are notable among the earlier nineteenth-century writers on the poetry and customs of the Celts. Renan's famous and poetic essay on The Poetry of the Celtic Races is concerned mostly with Celtic romance and religion, but its interpretation of the genius of the race is suggestive to the student of the lyric. So, also, though the author knew no Celtic, is Matthew Arnold's essay on Celtic Literature. On the ancient literature of the Gael, Morley has a chapter in his English Writers (1 : 164–202), and on the literature of the Cymry (1 : 203–239). In both instances attention is paid to the lyric element. To the valuable bibliography of sources appended to each chapter the student is referred. The student should also consider the modern Celtic revival, which has brought forth many tuneful lyric utterances, notably those of William Sharp (Fiona Macleod) and Yeats.

A. *Irish Lyrics.*

D. Hyde's Hist. of Irish Lit. (Lond.: 1899) must be used with extreme care in the older periods; for the more modern period it is trustworthy. The articles on Irish literature in the Encyc. Brit. and Hinneberg's Kult. d. Gegenwart, already mentioned, are authoritative. Probably the readiest and most dependable aid for following the history of Irish literature is Eleanor Hull's Text Book of Irish Lit. (2 parts, Lond.: 1904–08). — Of the more recent *collections* in English the following are helpful: W. Stokes and J. Strachan, Thesaurus Palaeohibernicus (2 vols. Cambridge: 1901–03); J. H. Bernard and R. Atkinson, Liber Hymnorum (Lond.: 1895); E. A. Sharp, Lyra Celtica, mostly modern (Edinb.: 1896); G. Sigerson, Bards of the Gael and Gall, entirely ancient (Lond.: 1897, Dublin: 1906), and other collections of the older bards by J. Hardiman and J. C. Mangan, as well as some specimens in *Zeitschr. f. celt. Philol.*, vol. II; D. Hyde, The Religious Songs of Connacht (2 vols. Lond.: 1906), Love Songs of Connacht (5th ed. Lond.: 1909), — representative collections of Irish folk-songs; J. McCarthy *et al.*, Irish Lit. (10 vols. Philadelphia: 1904); K. Meyer, Selections from Ancient Irish Poetry (2d ed. Lond.: 1913); H. R. Montgomery, Specimens of the Early Native Poetry of Ireland (Dublin: 1892). The publications of the Irish Texts Society (Nutt, Lond.: 1899 +), and of *Ériu*, the journal of the School of Irish Learning (ed. Kuno Meyer *et al.*, Hodges, Figgis, Dubl.: 1903 +), include originals and admirable translations into English of several of the best Celtic lyrists; also those of the Irish Archaeological and Celtic Society, which comprise, also, the Celtic Hymn of St. Colman in the Latin Liber Hymnorum, edited by J. H. Todd. Of early translations of Irish lyrics may be mentioned Charlotte Brooke's Reliques of Irish Poetry (Dublin: 1789), and James

Hardiman's Irish Minstrelsy (2 vols. Lond.: 1831). For further bibliography, see G. Dottin, La litt. gaélique de l'Irlande (*Revue de synthèse historique*, 3: 1), of which an English translation, with additions, has been published privately by Joseph Dunn (The Gaelic Lit. of Ireland. Washington: 1906).

B. *The Scottish Lyric.*

On the Gaelic literature of *Scotland* see Encyc. Brit. and Hinneberg; also Magnus Maclean, The Lit. of the Highlands (Lond.: 1904), Lit. of the Celts (Lond.: 1902), and Lit. of the Scottish Gael (Lond.: 1912). Much that is of lyrical strain in this literature is to be found in Sir James McGregor's Book of the Dean of Lismore, translated some three hundred years after its collection by T. McLauchlan (Edinb.: 1862). See also A. Cameron, Reliquiae Celticae (Inverness: 1892–94); J. Reid, Bibliotheca Scoto-Celtica (Glasgow: 1832); John Mackenzie, The Beauties of Gaelic Poetry (New ed. Edinb.: 1904); L. Macbean, Songs and Hymns of the Scottish Highlands (Edinb.: 1888); D. Mitchell, The Book of Highland Verse (Lond.: 1912); P. T. Patterson, Gaelic Bards (1890); M. C. Macleod, Modern Gaelic Bards (Sterling: 1908). Further bibliography by G. Dottin, *Revue de synthèse historique*, 8: 79–81. For Macpherson's so-called translations of Gaelic poems, Fragments of Ancient Poetry (1760), Temora (1763), with their romantic sentiment and lyrical cadences, the student will turn to the bibliographies of Ossianic literature — Lowndes' Bibliographer's Manual, Pt. VI (1861), A. Nutt's Ossian and Ossianic Literature (1899), and the references furnished in the Camb. Hist. Eng. Lit., vol. X, pp. 542–544. The ballads of the Gaelic Leabhar na Feinne were edited by Campbell of Islay in 1872.

C. *The Welsh Lyric.*

One of the earliest English translations of *Welsh* poetry was Evan Evans' Specimens of the Poetry of the Welsh Bards (Lond.: 1764). In 1848 appeared the Iolo Manuscripts (verse and prose) collected by Taliesin Williams; in 1849, the famous essay, The Literature of the Kymry, by Thomas Stephens (2d ed. 1876); and in 1850, Villemarqué's Poèmes des Bardes Bretons du VI^{e} siècle; in 1856, John Williams Ab Ithel's Ancient Welsh Grammar, containing the Raleg Welsh Poetry, with an English translation (Llandovery); and in 1868, W. F. Skene's Four Ancient Books of Wales, containing Cymric poems attributed to the bards of the 6th century. Other volumes of Welsh verse have been published by G. H. Borrow, A. P. Graves, E. O. Jones, O. Jones,

W. Owen, J. Parry, W. F. Skene, etc. For further information and recent bibliography see the Encyc. Brit. and Hinneberg; also J. C. Morrice, Manual of Welsh Lit. (Bangor: 1909).

On the popular and religious songs of *Brittany*, see the Barzas Breiz of Villemarqué (6th edition with French translation, 2 vols., Paris: 1865) and the English translation by Tom Taylor (1865); also J. Loth, Chrestomathie bretonne (Paris: 1890); N. Quellien, Chansons et danses des Bretons (Paris: 1889); and articles on Breton *chansons* in the *Revue celtique* (7: 171, 19: 1, 23: 121, etc.). Cf. Encyc. Brit. and Hinneberg; also G. Dottin, *Revue de synthèse historique*, 8: 93–104; and *Annales de Bretagne* (since 1901 for bibliog. of modern works on Breton lit.).

On *Cornish* and *Manx* literature, see Encyc. Brit. and Hinneberg.

For *versification*, see Kuno Meyer's Primer of Irish Metrics (Hodges, Figgis, Dublin), the appendix to which gives an alphabetical list of the poets of Ireland; and Douglas Hyde's works on the Poetry of Connacht, *passim*, as mentioned above; also John Strachan's translation of An Old-Irish Metrical Rule (in *Ériu*, vol. I).

XIII. **The German Lyric.**

Of monographs the following are helpful: H. Spiero, Gesch. der deutschen Lyrik seit Claudius (Leipz.: 1909); P. Witkop, Die neuere deutsche Lyrik (2 vols. Leipz.: 1910–1913); R. Findeis, Gesch. der deutschen Lyrik, for school purposes (Sammlung Göschen, Leipz.: 1914); John Lees, The German Lyric (Lond.: 1914); A. Biese, Lyrische Dichtung und neuere deutsche Lyriker (Berlin: 1896). Of the histories of German literature cited in the Appendix those by Calvin Thomas (in Literatures of the World; N.Y.: 1909), and W. Scherer (English trans. by Mrs. Conybeare, Oxford: 1885, New ed., 1906) will prove especially helpful to the English student. The former is both lucid and critical; the latter brilliant but sometimes capricious in its presentation of the development of German literature. Both are supplied with well-selected bibliographical appendixes for each chapter. J. G. Robertson's Hist. of German Lit. (1902), and his article Germ. Lit. in the Encyc. Brit., 11th ed., are also admirable and convenient introductions. Further indication of the poetry of all the periods will be found in K. Breul's Handy Bibliographical Guide to the Study of the German Language and Literature (Lond.: 1895); in the excellent biographical and bibliographical guide by Adolf Bartels, Handbuch zur Geschichte der deutschen Literatur (2d ed. Leipz.: 1909); in K. von Bahder's Die deutsche Philologie im Grundriss (Paderborn: 1883); and in Goedeke's masterly

Grundriss zur Geschichte der deutschen Dichtung (2d ed. Dresden: 1884 +). With these aids, and the *Jahresberichte für neuere deutsche Literaturgeschichte* (1892 +), the student need not fear going astray. For criticism of various works as they have appeared and continue to appear, see, in addition to the journal just mentioned, other excellent German Reviews mentioned in the Appendix, especially the *Jahresbericht über die Erscheinungen auf dem Gebiete der germanischen Philologie*, the contents of which for the last quarter of the 19th century have been reviewed under the editorship of R. Bethge in Ergebnisse und Fortschritte der germanistischen Wissenschaft im letzten Vierteljahrhundert (Leipz.: 1902). For references on German versification, see Gayley and Scott, pp. 509–511. For a history of the German sonnet, see H. Welti as cited above, § 5; for the German madrigal, K. Vossler as cited in the same section. For the song, see E. Schuré, Histoire du Lied (Paris: 1868; German trans., E. Schuré's Gesch. des deutschen Liedes, 3d ed. Minden i. W.: 1884); A. Reissmann, Das deutsche Lied in seiner historischen Entwickelung dargestellt, mit Musikbeilagen (Cassel: 1861), and Gesch. des deutschen Liedes, mit Musikbeilagen (Berlin: 1874). The folk song has been studied by L. Uhland (Abhandlung über das deutsche Volkslied, in Schriften z. Gesch. d. Dichtung u. Sage, vols. III, IV. Stuttgart: 1866), and, in a popular way, by F. E. Wackernagel (Das deutsche Volkslied. Hamburg: 1890) and A. F. C. Wilmar (Handbüchlein, etc. 3d ed. Marburg: 1886); studies relating to special periods are cited below. On the German hymn, see below, G; works on the history of other lyric kinds, as the Minne- and Meistersang, the ode, epigram, etc., are mentioned in the proper places, below. In *Germania*, the *Zeitschr. f. deut. Phil.*, and the *Zeitschr. f. deut. Altertum* may be found many short articles of high merit that are not noted below; students of the Minnesang should not neglect these periodicals.

Among *general collections* of German lyrics, K. A. Buchheim's Deutsche Lyrik (Lond.: 1886) and H. G. Fiedler's Oxford Book of German Verse and Buch deutscher Dichtung von Luther bis Liliencron (Oxford: 1916) are deservedly popular; Karl Grossmann's Handbuch zur Einführung in d. deutsche Literatur, Theil I, Poesie (Wolfenbüttel: 1877) is well constructed, and contains valuable critical notices. Other guides to German lyric poetry are: O. Wolff's Poetischer Hausschatz, W. Buchner's Deutsche Dichtung, Paldamus' Auswahl deutscher Dichtungen, Hansen's Deutsche Dichter und Prosaiker, Wyss' Poesie der neuen Zeit, F. Matthisson's Lyrische Anthologie (20 vols. Zürich: 1803–08), H. Bergmann's Deutschland's Lyrik, etc. But the student must always consult the volumes of the huge collection of national literature, — Kürschner's Deutsche National-Litteratur (222 vols. Berlin and Stuttgart: 1882–98), as well as the materials published as the Bibliothek des Literarischen Vereins in Stuttgart (Stuttgart: 1842 +). Collections of popular (folk) poetry are given below, H; for a volume of general selections see Erk-Böhme, Deutscher Liederhort, Auswahl der vorzüglicheren deutschen Volkslieder (3 vols. Leipz.: 1893–94).

A. *The Beginnings — Pagan Poetry.*

On the early German tribes see F. B. Gummere, Germanic Origins, A Study in Primitive Culture (N.Y.: 1892), and the works to which Professor Gummere refers.

For speculation concerning an early pagan lyric poetry (charms, riddles, and proverbs; funereal, wedding, and other occasional kinds; choral lyric, etc.), and the relation of such to Latin learning and poetry, material may be found in Paul's Grundriss der germanischen Philologie (2 Aufl., Bd. II, Abt. I, pp. 31–62. Strassburg: 1901–1909); Müllenhoff, De antiquissima Germanorum poesi chorica (Kiliae: 1847); Dietz, Antiquissima Germanicae poes. vestigia (Bonn: 1831); Scherer, vol. I, Chaps. I, II; Heinzel (in *Quellen und Forschungen*, No. X); P. S. Allen, as noted above, § 5; and Sievers, Altgermanische Metrik (Strassburg: 1905). Also for this period and the next, see vol. III of Ebert's Allgemeine Geschichte d. Lit. d. Mittelalters im Abendlande (3 vols. Leipz.: 1874–87); J. Kelle's Gesch. d. deutsch. Lit. von d. ältesten Zeit bis zur Mitte des 11ten Jahrh. (Berlin: 1892); and R. Koegel's Gesch. d. deutsch. Lit. bis zum Ausgange d. Mittelalters (vol. I. Strassburg: 1894–1897).

B. *The Old High German Period* (*c.* 750–1050).

Of the popular lyric that must have existed at this time there remain only two fragments (the Kleriker und Nonne, preserved in half-Latin, and the Liebesgruss in the Ruodlieb, also in Latin), and some Latin references to the early Winileod. The Merseburg Charms are relics of a pre-Christian age (compare the Anglo-Saxon Charms). A remnant of early Christian lyric is the Wessobrunn Prayer (*c.* 780). — For this period in general, see Müllenhoff und Scherer, Denkmäler deutscher Poesie und Prosa (3d ed. Berlin: 1892); for the Ruodlieb, see F. Seiler (Latin Text, Halle: 1882); M. Heyne (German trans., Leipz.: 1897); for the Winileod, W. Uhl (in *Teutonia*, No. 5. 1908). Paul's Grundriss, and the other guides mentioned above, under A, should be followed.

C. *Middle High German Period* (1050–1350).

The best guide to the period is F. Vogt's Mittelhochdeutsche Lit., in Paul's Grundriss: the Minnesingers and court poets of the eleventh to fourteenth centuries are considered in II, 1. 177 ff., 231, 251 ff.; editions are cited p. 177, *et passim.* See also vol. II of Kelle's Geschichte mentioned under A above, for the period 1050–1190; W. Scherer's Gesch. der deutschen Dichtung in 11. und 12. Jahrh. (in *Quellen und Forsch.*, No. 12. 1875); and W. Golther's Gesch. d. deutsch. Lit. von den ersten Anfängen bis zum Ausgang d. Mittelalters (vol. 163 of Kürschner). An older work is J. W. O. Richter's Die lyrischen Dichtungen des deutschen Mittelalters. Vorträge (Leipz.: 1872). For the student who is limited to works in English, the best introduction and guide is F. C. Nicholson's Old German Love Songs (Chicago, Univ. of Chicago Press: 1907). For other histories of the period, see Appendix.

Collections and translations. The chief and complete edition of the lyric singers before Vogelweide is that of K. Lachmann and M. Haupt, Des Minnesangs Frühling (4 Aufl. Leipz.: 1888). The most useful selections from the lyrics of the entire Middle German Period will be found in K. Bartsch's Deutsche Liederdichter des 12. bis 14. Jahrhunderts (4th ed. Ed. by W. Golther. Berlin: 1901), — with a valuable historical introduction; and in Kürschner's Nationallit., vol. VIII, where F. Pfaff edits Der Minnesang des 12.–14. Jahrhunderts (1892–95). See also Pfaff's edition of Die grosse Heidelberger Liederhandschrift (Heidelb.: 1899–1907). F. H. von der Hagen's great collection — the most complete — was published in Leipzig, in 1838, — a pioneer in the study of the type. The Swiss Minnesingers have been edited by Bartsch, with a valuable introduction (Frauenfeld: 1886). Other German collections have been made by Manesse (Zürich: 1758–59), Benecke (Göttingen: 1810–32), Müller (Berlin: 1784–85). — The "first attempt to present English readers with a fairly large and typical selection of the German Minnesingers from the twelfth to fourteenth centuries" is that of F. C. Nicholson, mentioned above; see also J. Bithell, The Minnesingers, trans., with introd., notes, etc. Compare Taylor's Lays of the Minnesingers (Lond.: 1825) and A. E. Kroeger's The Minnesinger of Germany (Lond.: 1873). Other references in English — none of much value — are mentioned by Nicholson, pp. lvi-lvii. For the religious poetry of the period, see P. Piper, Die geistliche Dichtung des Mittelalters (vol. 3 of Kürschner's Deutsche National-Litteratur. Berlin and Stuttgart: 1888).

The secular lyric was at first retarded by the monastic reforms of the time. A few religious lyrics, especially Mariendichtung (i. e. poetry addressed to the Virgin), are about the only thing in the nature of lyric that the student meets until the middle of the twelfth century (see P. Piper, as noted above). But from about 1150 on the courtly romance of Knighthood and the aristocratic secular lyric of the Minnesingers flourished in great profusion. Of the former, exotic in so far as it borrowed its themes from French romances of Latin material and the Celtic romances "gallicized by Chrétien de Troyes and his confrères," the founders were Eilhart von Oberge (Tristant, *c.* 1170); Heinrich von Veldeke, whose rhyming romance, Eneit (*c.* 1190), is important not only because it sings of Minne — or idealized love — but because it establishes the metrical form in which most of the succeeding romances were written; and Hartmann von Aue, who, in the Erec and Iwein, naturalized the Arthurian romance of Chrétien. Hartmann was still living in 1210. With him was closely associated in poetic sympathy if not in religious fervor, Gottfried von Strassburg (*ob.* 1210), whose Tristan is an idealization of erotic passion. The greatest of the early poets of the Celtic romance of chivalry, however, was Wolfram von Eschenbach (*fl.* 1200–1217). His Parzival is, as Professor Thomas says, "an apotheosis of *Treue*," or fidelity. "He wished to commend an ideal of perfection: one that included the ideals of secular knighthood, but also something more, namely, the idea of the purified soul at peace with God." In the romances of Hartmann, Gottfried, and Wolfram idyllic and lyric strains abound.

There were also poets of the pure lyric of love and springtime, known as the Minnegesang or Minnesang. Originating perhaps in eastern Germany, but in the west coming under Provençal influence (see Jeanroy, Gaston Paris, *op. cit.*, *supra*, § 5), the Minnesang developed rapidly, and the close of the twelfth and the opening of the thirteenth century saw the work of its greatest masters. Among the earlier writers (1150–1190) were Der von Kürenberg and Dietmar von Aist. They were succeeded by von Veldeke, Friedrich von Hausen, Heinrich von Morungen, Reinmar von Hagenau, Rudolf von Fenis, Albrecht von Johannsdorf, etc., — the singers of a period which attained full flower of delicate sentiment, chivalric ecstasy, and 'woman-worship,' as well as of artistic finish, in "the greatest of mediaeval lyrists," Walther von der Vogelweide (*fl.* 1198–1230). In the period of gradual decline after 1230, while middle-class utilitarianism and didacticism were asserting themselves against the old aristocratic ideal of chivalry, the more noteworthy writers either supported the courtly ideal (as did the fantastic Ulrich von Lichtenstein and the ardent Johann Hadlaub of Zürich) or turned for their subjects, half appreciatively, half satirically, to the life of the peasant and the burgher (Neidhart von Reuenthal, Steinmar von Klingenau, and 'Freidank,' the satirist) or trifled with some particular minor type of expression ('Der Tannhäuser' with the *pastourelle*, Reinmar von Zweter and 'Frauenlob,' i.e. Heinrich von Meissen, with the *Spruchdichtung*).

The student will be interested in tracing resemblances between the Minnesang and the Provençal lyric. The exact nature of the relations between the two is still in dispute. At any rate, the two schools afford a valuable opportunity for comparative study of the rise of the feudal court lyric. P. S. Allen (see above, § 5) endeavors to trace the German lyric back to a Latin origin. On the Latin Goliardic poems of the 12th and 13th centuries, see above, V, E, F.

Editions. For most of the lyric poetry of this age the reader will turn to the general collections noted above; for the poetry of the romancers, to § 12, XI, below. The following editions of separate authors should also be used: F. Keinz, Die Lieder Neidharts von Reuenthal (Leipz.: 1889); G. Roethe, Die Gedichte Reinmars von Zweter (Leipz.: 1887); L. Ettmüller, ed. of 'Frauenlob,' i.e. H. von Meissen (1843); H. Paul, Die Gedichte Walthers von der Vogelweide (Halle: 1882. 2d ed., 1894. In *Altdeutsche Textbibliothek*, vol. I); other editions of Walther von der Vogelweide, by K. Lachmann (7th ed., by Kraus, Berlin: 1907), W. Wackernagel and M. Rieger (1862), F. Pfeiffer (6th ed., 1880, in Kürschner, vol. I); W. Wilmanns

(2d ed., 1883). — A. Schmeller's Carmina Burana, lateinische und deutsche Lieder und Gedichte . . . des 13. Jahrh., etc. (Stuttgart: 1847; 3d ed., Breslau: 1894) should be consulted for Goliardic verse (see above, V, E).

References. The following with few exceptions will afford great aid: A. Angermann, Der Wechsel in der mhd. Lyrik (Diss., Marburg: 1910); K. Bartsch, Der Strophenbau in der deutschen Lyrik (in *Germania*, 2: 257–298); R. Becker, Der mittelalterliche Minnedienst in Deutschland (Leipz.: 1895); by the same, Der altheimische Minnesang (Halle: 1882); A. Boerkel, Frauenlob (2d ed. 1881); E. Haakh, Die Naturbetrachtung bei den mhd. Lyrikern (in *Teutonia*, Nos. 9, 11. 1908); E. Haupt, Ueber die deutsche Lyrik bis zu Walther von der Vogelweide. II. Die romanisierenden Dichter (Progr. Schneeberg: 1896); E. Henrici, Zur Geschichte der mittelhochdeutschen Lyrik (Berlin: 1876); H. Jantzen, on the Streitgedicht, as noted above, § 5; E. Joseph, Die Frühzeit des deutschen Minnesangs, Kürenberglieder (in *Quellen und Forsch.*, No. 79. 1896); H. Jung, Beiträge zur Geschichte des nord- und mitteldeutschen Minnesangs (Frankfurt: 1891); F. Lechleitner, Der deutsche Minnesang (Wolfenbüttel: 1893); A. Lüderitz, Die Liebestheorien der Provenzalen bei den Minnesingern der Stauferzeit (in *Litthist. Forsch.*, No. 29. 1904), — cf. Chaytor's The Troubadours, Chap. IX, and Jeanroy, Origines, etc.; O. Lyon, Minne- und Meistersang (Leipz.: 1883), — popular; E. Martin, Die Carmina Burana und die Anfänge des deutschen Minnesangs (in *Zeitschr. f. deut. Altertum*, 20: 46–69. 1877); F. Michel, H. von Morungen und die Troubadours (in *Quellen und Forsch.*, No. 38. 1880); B. Q. Morgan, Nature in M H G Lyrics (in *Hesperia*, No. 4. 1912); W. Nickel, Sirventes und Spruchdichtung (as noted above, § 5); M. B. Ogle, Classical Lit. Tradition in Early German and Romance Lit. (in *Mod. Lang. Notes*, Dec. 1912); G. Pralle, Die Frauenstrophen im ältesten deutschen Minnesang (Halle: 1892); F. Saran, Hartmann von Aue als Lyriker (Halle: 1889); G. Schläger, Studien über das Tagelied (Jena: 1895), — the Tagelied is the same as the Provençal *alba*; A. E. Schönbach, Die Anfänge des deutschen Minnesangs (Graz: 1898), — one of the best monographs on the subject; cf. the same author's articles in the *Zeitschr. für deut. Altertum*, 27: 343, 29: 121, 34: 146; A. Schultz, Das höfische Leben zur Zeit der Minnesinger (2d ed. Leipz.: 1889); J. Siebert, Tannhäuser, Inhalt und Form seiner Gedichte (in *Berliner Beiträge*, No. 5. 1894); E. Stilgebauer, Geschichte des Minnesangs (Weimar: 1898), — "untrustworthy and superficial"; O. Streicher, Zur Entwickl. der mhd.

Lyrik (in *Zeitschr. für deut. Philol.*, 1892, p. 166 ff.); J. L. Uhland, Abhandlung über die deutschen Volkslieder (in vols. III and IV of the Gesammelte Schriften zur Geschichte der Dichtung und Sage (8 vols. Stuttgart: 1865–73), — important historically; E. T. Walter, Ueber den Ursprung des höfischen Minnesanges und sein Verhältniss zur Volksdichtung (Wien: 1889); A. Wallensköld, Les rapports entre la poésie lyrique romane et la poésie allemande au moyen-âge (N. phil. Mittlgen., Helsingfors: 1900); E. Wechssler, Das Kulturproblem des Minnesangs (2 vols. Halle a. S.: 1909 +; cf. *Romania*, 39: 386), — an important and informing work in which the relations of the Minnesang to Provence and to the Church and Chivalry are discussed; K. Weinhold, Die deutschen Frauen in dem Mittelalter (3d ed. Wien: 1897).

On Walther von der Vogelweide, Wilmanns' Leben und Dichten Walthers v. d. Vogelweide (Bonn: 1882) is standard. A. E. Schönbach's Walther v. d. Vogelweide (3d ed. Berlin: 1910) incorporates the later researches. See also two works by K. Burdach, Reinmar der Alte und Walther v. d. Vogelweide (Leipz.: 1880), and Walther v. d. Vogelweide (Leipz.: 1900), which contains bibliography, pp. 118–122. The English student will welcome an essay by E. W. Gosse in his Studies in the Literature of Northern Europe (Lond.: 1879). Uhland's essay is contained in vol. V of his Gesammelte Schriften, mentioned in the last paragraph, above.

For the characteristics of the lyric as produced by the courtly romancers of love and chivalry, Veldeke, Hartmann, Wolfram, and Gottfried, consult also the bibliography under The German Epic, § 12, XI, C, 2, below.

D. *Early New High German Period* (1350–1700).

On the *Meistergesang*, see in general Bartels' Handbuch, pp. 62–66, Goedeke's Grundriss zur Geschichte der deutschen Dichtung, 2d ed., § 91 ff. (Bd. I, 307), and Paul's Grundriss, II, 1, p. 312 ff. The student will do well to consult the valuable though antiquated data of Wagenseil, De Civitate Norimbergensi (1597), and J. Grimm, Über den altdeutschen Meistergesang (Göttingen: 1811), — a pioneer study that shows the relation between the Minnesang and Meistergesang, but must be checked by more recent researches; Uhland, as cited above; and, among later works, Schnorr von Carolsfeld, Zur Geschichte des deutschen Meisterges. (Berlin: 1872), Lyon's Minne- und Meistersang (cited above), Mey's Der Meisterges., in Gesch. und Kunst (Karlsruhe: 1892), and O. Weddingen's Zur Gesch. des Meistergesangs (Wiesbaden: 1891).

— On the *Classical Renaissance*, see Bartels, p. 111 ff.; Freiherr M. von Waldberg, Die deutsche Renaissancelyrik (Berlin: 1888), which treats of the secular lyrics of the first half of the 17th century; by the same, Die galante Lyrik (in *Quellen u. Forsch.*, No. 56. 1885), second Silesian school; K. Burdach, Vom Mittelalter zur Reformation (Halle: 1893); K. Borinski, Die Poetik der Renaissance in Deutschland (Berlin: 1886); L. Geiger, Renaissance und Humanismus in Italien und Deutschland (Berlin: 1882); E. Höpfner, Reformationsbestrebungen auf dem Gebiete der deutschen Dichtung des 16. und 17. Jahrh. (Göttingen: 1886); E. Schmidt, Der Kampf gegen die Mode in der deutschen Lit. des 17. Jahrh. (in Characteristiken, vol. I. Berlin: 1902). The Anmerkungen to Vilmar's Deutsche Litteraturgesch., pp. 683–689, comprise a good bibliography of the seventeenth-century lyrists. See also, for a general view, Calvin Thomas, German Lit., Chap. X; T. S. Perry, From Opitz to Lessing (Boston: 1885); and the accounts in Gervinus, Gesch. d. poet. National-Lit., 3: 213 ff., in Lemcke, Gesch. d. deutsch. Dichtung der neuerer Zeit (Leipz.: 1882), and in the various literary histories of the period mentioned in the Appendix. Other general references, on the *Volkslieder*, and on the *Hymn*, are given below.

Collections of *texts* will be found in the many volumes (over 200) of the Stuttgarter Literarischer Verein; in W. Braune's Neudrucke deutscher Literaturwerke des 16. und 17. Jahrh., — another vast collection, begun in 1876; in K. Goedeke und J. Tittmann, Deutsche Dichter des 16. Jahrh. (18 vols. 1867 ff.), and Deutsche Dichter des 17. Jahrh. (15 vols. 1869 ff.).

The courtly Minnesang first merged in, and then gave place to, the Meistergesang, which was cultivated by guilds of artisans in the wealthy cities of Germany. The transition may be traced in the poems of Peter Suchenwirt (*fl.* 1350–1400) and Michael Beheim (1416– *c.* 1474). The Meistersingers were distinguished by a self-conscious artificiality of subject (religious, moral, sophistical) and of form in accordance with an intricate system of pedantic rules taught in the various 'schools.' Of these that at Augsburg (1450) was the earliest (with Hans Rosenblüt) and that of Nürnberg the most famous. The greatest of these lyrists was Hans Sachs (1494–1576), who however could not inject the spirit of real poetry into the convention of the Meistergesang. The sixteenth century saw the decline of national poetic diction and metres, the ascendancy of theological controversy, and of classical humanism which, in its devotion especially to the Latin language, was wont to hold the German in contempt. The only genuine currents of poetry to survive were that of the folk-song, and that of the old Minnesang as turned into the channel of psalmody by Burkhard Waldis (1553). The best characteristics of the popular lyric (*Volkslied*) passed into the Protestant hymns of Luther (Geistliche Lieder, 1524) and of his successors, Speratus, Decius, etc.; cf. below, under G. — The seventeenth century witnessed the setting up of classical standards, under French-Italian influences, first by Weckherlin (*fl.* 1616–1653), and then by Opitz (1597–1639) and his followers. Opitz aimed not only by the example set in his songs, odes, sonnets, and alexandrine poems, but through the doctrine of his Prosodia Germanica (Brieg: 1624), to purify poetic diction (by eliminating foreign and undignified words and enriching its epithets) and to regulate its metres (by substituting accent for quantity and limiting the foot to iamb or trochee). His influence, which lasted well into the eighteenth century, may be traced in Swedish and Danish-Norwegian poetry as well, and affords a fruitful subject of study in comparative poetics. Much lyric verse of little poetic value was written under these auspices, but metrical regularity, purity of diction, and dignity of ornament were in large measure achieved. Under the rather absurd but stimulating encouragement of the various literary societies that came into existence in the first half of the century this poetic activity was carried on. Of the societies the most famous were the 'Fruchtbringende Gesellschaft' and Harsdörffer's 'Die Gesellschaft der Schäfer an der Pegnitz.' — Three of the poets of the Opitz movement, or First Silesian School, were Friedrich von Logau, Paul Fleming, and Andreas Gryphius. With them the student will naturally group for consideration other poets — of schools inspired by the Silesian, but in one direction or another breaking away from the doctrine and manner of Opitz: for instance, Dach, Roberthin, and Albert of the Königsberg; Rist and others of the Holstein; and finally the shepherd poets of the Pegnitz — Harsdörffer, Klai, and others of Nürnberg, in whose bucolic inanities and fantastic verse the simplicity of Opitz is reduced to bathos.

It is, however, probably in the nature-loving and ardently religious verse of the Jesuit, Friedrich von Spee, of the second and third decades of the century, in the folk-poetry of Simon Dach's Ännchen von Tharau, and in the sacred poetry of the evangelical church that the student will detect the genuine current of the popular lyric. The hymns and other religious verses of Fleming and Gryphius, of Dach (1603–59), of Johann Rist, Heinrich Albert, the Kurfürstin von Brandenburg, Johann Heermann, and Scheffler (Angelus Silesius), and especially of Paul Gerhardt (1607–76), the most tender and poetic of German hymn-writers, and of his younger contemporaries Neumark and Neander, deserve careful attention as the expression of spiritual outlook and ideals in and after the period of the Thirty Years' War.

In direct antithesis to the preceding is the lyric of the Second Silesian School — sensual, artificial, devoid of taste — a revulsion from Opitz and an imitation of the worst that could be found in Guarini and Marino. The leaders in this movement were Hofmann von Hofmannswaldau (1617–79) and Kaspar von Lohenstein (1635–83). The Heldenbriefe of the former and the Venus of the latter may profitably be studied in the light of materials already furnished, under VIII, G, above.

Editions and References. *On Beheim*, see von der Hagen, Samml. für altd. Litt., p. 75, and von Karajan, Beheims Buch v. d. Wienern (1843). *On Hans Sachs*, see the introduction to Goedeke's Dichtungen von Hans Sachs (Erster Teil, XIX ff.; Leipz.: 1870), and the edition of his works in the Bibliothek des Literarischen Vereins in Stuttgart; also, Bartels, pp. 99–102; Schweitzer's Un poète allemand au XVI^{e} siècle (Nancy: 1889); Weller's Der Volksdichter Hans Sachs (Nürnberg: 1868). — *On the Volkslieder*, see Bartels, pp. 66–73; Uhland, Gesammelte Schriften, vols. III, IV; von Liliencron, Die historischen Volkslieder der Deutschen vom 13. bis 16. Jahrhundert (4 vols. Leipz.:

1865–1869), ending with 1564; F. L. Mittler, Sammlung alter und neuer Volkslieder (Marb. u. Leipz.: 1845); G. Scherer, Die schönsten deutschen Volkslieder (Stuttg.: 1863, 1868); A. F. C. Vilmar, Handbüchlein für Freunde des deutschen Volksliedes (Marb.: 1879); F. M. Böhme, Altdeutsches Liederbuch . . . aus dem 12. bis zum 17. Jahrh. (Leipz.: 1877); and the collections of Simrock, Volkslieder; von Detfurth, Fränkische Volkslieder, and so forth. See also under H *German Popular Poetry*, below. Exhaustive bibliographies of Scandinavian, German, and Dutch folk-songs are given in Paul's Grundriss, II, 1, pp. 1146–1161, 1178–1219, furnishing thorough critical paraphernalia for the student of the popular lyric of the nations mentioned. — *On the Protestant hymn*, see Bartels, pp. 92–96, 130; Paul, pp. 302, 308 ff. For an introductory bibliography, see Vilmar's Deutsche Litteraturgeschichte, pp. 686–688 (Marb.: 1886), and for texts, A. Fischer, Das evangelische deutsche Kirchenlied des 17. Jahrh. (4 vols. Gütersloh: 1908). See also, below, G *The German Hymn*. — *On the Latin poetry* of the age, see A. Schröter, Beiträge zur Geschichte der neulateinischen Poesie Deutschlands und Hollands (in *Palaestra*, No. 77); G. Manacorda, Della poesia latina in Germania durante il Rinascimento (Roma: 1907; from the *Atti* of the R. Accademia dei Lincei, S. V., vol. XII), — with which may be used Geiger's Renaissance und Humanismus, and Goedeke's Grundriss. For a voluminous collection of these old poems, see the Deliciae poetarum Germanorum (6 vols., Frankfurt: 1612); see also No. 7 of the Lateinische Litt. Denkmäler des XV. und XVI. Jahrhunderts, which contains a selection of Latin lyrics of the 16th century, edited by G. Ellinger. R. Levy's Martial und die deutsche Epigrammatik des XVII. Jahrh. (Stuttg.: 1903) is also useful in tracing classical influence. — *On Waldis*, see F. L. Mittler, Herzog Heinrichs von Braunschweig Klagelied (Cassel: 1855, — appendix on Das Leben und die Dichtungen des Burkhard Waldis); also G. Buchenau (Marb.: 1858). — *On Paul Melissus* (Schede), not mentioned in the preceding sketch of the 16th-century lyric but significant as anticipating Opitz in the learned and classical style and as a poetic translator of the Psalms (1572) and one of the first writers of sonnets in German (1560–70), see O. Taubert, De vita et scriptis Pauli Schedii Melissi dissertatio (Bonn: 1859). — *On the Sonnet*, cf. R. Köhler, Das älteste deutsche Sonett und sein ital. Original (in the author's Kleinere Schriften III. Berlin: 1898–1900; also in *Archiv Littgesch.* 9: 4–8. 1880), which refers to a translation (1556) by C. Wirsung of an Italian sonnet into German; H. Welti, as noted above, § 5. — *On Weckherlin*, see E. Höpfner, Weckherlins Ode und Gesänge, ein Beitrag zur Gesch.

der deut. Dichtung (Berlin: 1865); H. Fischer, G. R. Weckherlins Gedichte (Tübingen: 1893–1907); W. Bohm, Englands Einfluss auf G.R.W. (Diss., Göttingen: 1893). — *On Opitz*, see Bartels, 114–116; on *Fleming*, 117; *Dach*, 120; *Rist*, 121; *Harsdörffer*, 124, — and so with regard to the other seventeenth-century poets mentioned above. — *On the literary societies and schools*, see Barthold's Geschichte der Fruchtbringenden Gesellschaft (1848); G. Krause's Der Fruchtbringenden Gesellschaft ältester Ertzschrein (1855); Johann Herdegen, Historische Nachricht von des löblichen Hirten- und Blumen-Ordens an der Pegnitz Anfang und Fortgang (Nürnberg: 1744); J. Tittmann, Die Nürnberger Dichterschule: Harsdörffer, Klai, Birken (Göttingen: 1847); Otto Schulz, Die deutschen Gesellschaften des 17. Jahrh. — The following special studies will also be useful: Th. Hansen, Johann Rist und seine Zeit (Halle: 1872); V. Manheimer, Die Lyrik des Andreas Gryphius: Studien und Materialien (Berlin: 1904), — an admirable work; G. Steinhausen, Die Anfänge des französischen Literatur- und Kultureinflusses in Deutschland (in *Zeitschr. für vgl. Lit.*, Bd. 7); K. Vossler, Das deutsche Madrigal (in Schick und Waldberg's *Literarh. Forsch.*, No. 6. Weimar: 1898); C. H. Herford, Studies in the Literary Relations of England and Germany in the 16th Century (1886); G. Waterhouse, The Lit. Relations of England and Germany in the 17th Century (Cambridge: 1914), Chaps. II, XI; G. Witkowski, Die Vorläufer der anakreontischen Dichtung in Deutschland (in *Zeitschr. für vgl. Lit.*, Bd. 3. 1890). *For texts* of the poets *of the First Silesian School*, the Königsberg, Nürnberg etc., and the religious lyrists, see in general K. Goedeke and J. Tittmann's Deutsche Dichter des 17. Jahrhunderts; Goedeke's Elf Bücher deutscher Dichtung; the Bibliothek des Literarischen Vereins in Stuttgart. — *For the Second Silesian School*, Kürschner's Deutsche Nat.-Lit., and C. Müller, Beiträge zum Leben und Dichten Daniel Kaspars von Lohenstein (in *German. Abhand.*, No. 1. 1882).

For an illustration of the naïve state of historical criticism of the lyric at the close of the seventeenth century, see Sigmund von Birken's Teutsche Redebind und Dichtkunst, etc. (Nürnberg: 1679). Birken's literary history begins with the songs of Moses (he gives the date, 2415 B.C.), though he suspects that Noah and Jacob may have listened to the songs of shepherds. He regards the hymn as the first literary species, and to it and its allied kinds he gives far more space than was usually devoted to the lyric by early critics (cf. pp. 223, 227, 230, of K. Borinski's Die Poetik der Renaissance in Deutschland (Berlin: 1886)).

E. *The Eighteenth Century.*

In studying the lyric of this century the student will get most aid from the general literary histories (see Appendix), especially that of Hettner; but he will do well to consult P. Witkop's Die neuere deutsche Lyrik (Leipz.: 1910), which covers the period from von Spee (first half of the seventeenth century) to Hölderlin; the second volume of this work (1913) continues the subject. See also M. Friedlaender, Das deutsche Lied im 18. Jahrh. (Stuttgart: 1902). On the first half of the century, see A. Schröter, Entwicklung des deutschen Lyrik in der ersten Hälfte des 18. Jahrh. (Wolmirstädt: 1879).

Of *collections* of the poetry of the period we may mention: Brockhaus' Bibliothek der deutschen Nationalliteratur des 18. und 19. Jahrh. (44 vols. 1869–91); B. Seuffert and A. Sauer's excellent Deutsche Literaturdenkmale des 18. und 19. Jahrh. (18th century, Seuffert, 50 parts, 1882–94; continuation, 18th and 19th centuries, Sauer, 1894 +).

About the beginning of the century some minor poets, such as von Besser, König, von Canitz, and Neukirch, revolting against the excesses of the Second Silesian School, attempted, but with slight inspiration, a return to simpler subjects and more regular forms of lyric verse. They were followed by Günther (1695–1723) and Brockes (1680–1747), heralds of the new poetry: the former a lyrist of warmth and vitality who expressed with artistic power the ecstasy of passion and of pain; the latter a descriptive writer, whose Irdisches Vergnügen in Gott (1723), dignified and earnest, introduced the moralizing strain of Pope, and whose translation at a later date of Thomson's Seasons affected the course of landscape poetry. The English influence was reinforced by the Swiss scholar Johann Jakob Bodmer (1698–1783), who, in his Diskurse der Maler (1721), written after the model of Addison's *Spectator*, pointed out the vanity of the existing French school of German poets and critics, and by his translation of Milton's Paradise Lost in 1730 prepared the way for the coming age of *Begeisterung* in German poetry, the period of imagination and emotion, and of enthusiasm for the wonderful and the sublime.

The first brilliant lyric poets of the intervening period of preparation were Albrecht von Haller (1708–1777) and Friedrich von Hagedorn (1708–1754). The former, under the influence of Pope's style and undoubtedly inspired by the critical doctrines of his countryman, Bodmer, produced in 1732 a volume of Swiss poems, the most famous of which, Die Alpen, at once carried to a higher level the landscape poetry of Brockes and initiated the reflective lyric of rural simplicity and contentment. In this manner of verse, Haller is the predecessor of von Creuz, von Kleist, and a numerous train. To the period of preparation von Hagedorn, on the other hand, contributed the Horatian lyric of social life, graceful in form and joyous of content, and by his Anacreontic verses paved the way for one of the characteristic tendencies of the Halle school of poets. This, sometimes called the Prussian school, cultivated not only the Anacreontic lyric of the Graces and the care-free life, but also the serious ode (Uz, 1720–1796, and Ramler, 1722–1798), the lyric of war and patriotism (von Kleist, 1715–1759; Gleim, 1719–1803; and Ramler), and the reflective poetry of nature and the idyllic life — of which von Kleist's Der Frühling (1749) is the masterpiece: a model for many poets, contemporary and succeeding.

During the second quarter of the century, the influence of the English poets already mentioned, and of Edward Young, gained steadily in significance. In 1725, however, Johann Christoph Gottsched (1700–1766), in philosophy a rationalist and in literary theory a stalwart follower of Opitz and Boileau, had, in his lectures upon poetry at Leipzig, begun to advocate the regularity, the thoughtful balance, and lucidity of the classical French poets, and had established a Leipzig school of literary criticism. In 1729 he produced the first edition of his formal Kritische Dichtkunst, and, from 1730 on, he ruled poetics as a dictator. Naturally opposed to the English cult of Bodmer and his disciple, Breitinger, he viewed askance their talk of phantasy, emotion, inspiration, and their worship of Milton and the sublime. When, in 1737, he published in the second edition of his Kritische Dichtkunst a bitter attack upon the Paradise Lost, and Bodmer replied with his epoch-making defence of the poet, Vom Wunderbaren in der

Poesie (Zürich: 1740), the war was on. Gottsched in the next year retorted with his Der Dichterkrieg. Some of the poets among Gottsched's younger scholars, such as Gellert, Ebert, Cramer, at first stood by him; but in 1742, wearying of his unimaginative strife and doctrine, they broke away and founded as the organ of their "contributions to the enjoyment of understanding and wit" the Bremer *Beiträge*. This publication was destined to be the most important vehicle of a new criticism and poetry. The Saxon school thus instituted took as its master von Hagedorn, and soon attracted to itself Gleim and others of the Prussian school and, finally, the poet who was to bring to a close the period of preparation and open that of the new era, Friedrich Gottlieb Klopstock (1724–1803). So far as the history of the lyric is concerned, the student will be interested in Gellert (1716–1769), Cramer, and Ebert of the Saxon school, principally because of their spiritual songs. Those of Gellert betray the lingering didacticism of Gottsched; the odes of Cramer have more of the enthusiasm of Klopstock.

With the publication in the Bremer *Beiträge* (1748) of Klopstock's Messias (the first three cantos) the New Poetry was established. In his epic, fervid, noble, but tedious, Klopstock's inspiration is from Milton by way of Bodmer. His odes, especially those written before he fell under the influence of Norse mythology, have the quality of personal and intimate emotion, lyric swing and sustained flight, and the elements of originality and elasticity. His surprising adaptation of rhymeless, Horatian metres will interest the student. With the translation of Young's Conjectures on Original Composition in 1759, and of the same poet's Night Thoughts, by Ebert, for the *Beiträge* in 1760, and with the appearance in Germany of Macpherson's Ossian in 1764, Klopstock's poems, his odes included, began to assume the tinge of English sentimentality, the symbolism and rhapsody of the bardic incantation. These influences — and that of Percy's Reliques, in and after 1765, which apprised Germany of the healthier, homelier simplicities and mysteries of the English ballad — bore directly upon the school of Klopstock: they color the lyrical output of a society of younger poets founded in 1772 to do homage to their master, and incidentally to pour contempt on Wieland whose apotheosis of sensual beauty and advocacy of the French literary fashions of the reign of Louis XV ran counter to the prevailing current. This society, the 'Göttinger Dichterbund,' numbered among its lyric poets, Bürger (1747–1794), Hölty (1748–1776), Friedrich Leopold von Stolberg (1750–1819), and Voss (1751–1826). Beside Klopstock, these young men honored also Herder and they greeted the rising genius of Goethe. Their devotion, as the years elapsed, to the folk-songs and ballads of earlier Germany, to Shakespeare, and to Homeric and other Greek models not only benefited the lyric of the new age but was prophetic of the Romantic school of the nineteenth century. In 1774 appeared Bürger's Lenore, one of the most important documents in the history of romantic lyrism. Among the followers of Voss and Bürger, and consequently to be mentioned with the lyric poets of the Dichterbund, were Kosegarten, Claudius, Johann Martin Miller, and L. F. Günther von Göckingk.

The Dichterbund with its source in the wonderful and sublime of Bodmer's teaching and the poetic inspiration of Klopstock was, however, but one of the tributaries that swelled the rising flood of the new period of original genius — the period which ushered in the crowning era of German literature. The 'Sturm und Drang' period (a name borrowed from Klinger's tempestuous drama of 1775) had sources more immediate in Rousseau's glorification of natural impulse, in Wieland's appeal to the senses, in Lessing's revolt against the formal French canons of criticism and his vivification of aesthetic theory (the Laokoon of 1766, the Hamburgische Dramaturgie of 1767–1768), and, more immediate still, in the Fragmenten der deutschen Litteratur (1767) and the Kritische Wälder (1768) of Johann Gottfried Herder (1744–1803). In these and succeeding treatises on Ossian, Shakespeare, Homer, on the folk-song (Stimmen der Völker in Liedern: 1778), and on Hebrew poetry (1782), Herder taught that poetry proceeds not from the imitation of models but from the possession of the originality, natural freshness, sincerity, energy, sensuous creativity that produce the 'models' themselves. The characteristic of the Storm and Stress period (from 1767 to about 1787) was the assertion of individual genius as superior to all conventions of culture. This was the period of the blossoming individualism of Herder, Goethe, and Schiller in Germany. It corresponds with the period in France when Rousseau had finally "emancipated the passions from the domination of the understanding, and had liberated the imagination." In this glowing period, under the influence of Herder and Rousseau, the liberation of German literature from the false formalism of the first half of the century was completed; and under the enthusiastic genius of Goethe, Lenz, Schiller, and others, the lyric became again a thing of natural and spontaneous utterance. — With the close of the century and the beginning of the next, we associate the maturer, truly classic lyrics of Goethe and Schiller. The period is usually called by German literary historians the Classical.

Texts and References. For *texts*, in general, see Kürschner, and the collections noted at the head of this subdivision; for bibliography of the various poets, works and criticism, see Bartels, p. 151 ff. — *On Gottsched*, see M. Koch, Gottsched und die Reform der deutschen Literatur (Hamburg: 1887); G. Waniek, Gottsched und die deutsche Literatur (Leipz.: 1897); E. Reichel, Gottsched der Deutsche; and of earlier treatises, Th. W. Danzel, Gottsched und seine Zeit (Leipz.: 1848), and M. Bernays, J. W. von Goethe und J. C. Gottsched (Leipz.: 1880; the Gottsched reprinted from Allgemeine Deutsche Biographie, vol. IX, 1879). See, also, *for Gottsched and Bodmer*, Gayley and Scott, pp. 301, 318, 423, especially the work mentioned on p. 423 — O. Neboliczka's Schäferdichtung und Poetik im 18. Jahrh. (*Vierteljahrsch. f. Litteraturgesch.* 2. 22), which gives full bibliography and an excellent history of poetics during the century. The most critical modern discussion of Bodmer will be found in J. Bächtold, Geschichte der deutschen Literatur in der Schweiz (Frauenfeld: 1892). — *For Haller* see the introduction to his Gedichte, edited by L. Hirtzel (Frauenfeld: 1882); — *for von Hagedorn*, H. Schuster, F. von Hagedorn (Leipz.: 1882); G. Witkowski, Die Vorläufer der anakreontischen Dichtung, as noted above. — *For* *the Prussian School*, W. Körte's edition of Gleim's Sämmtliche Werke (vols. I–VII, Halberstadt: 1811–13; vol. VIII, Leipz.: 1841), and the same editor's Sämmtliche Werke of von Kleist (Berlin: 1803, 1853); and Göckingk's edition of Ramler's Poetische Werke (2 vols., Berlin: 1800, 1825). — For the founders of the *Bremer Beiträge*, see Hettner's Gesch. d. deutsch. Lit. im 18. Jahrh., vol. I; O. Neboliczka, as above, Die deutsche Schäferdichtung von Gottsched bis auf die Bremer Beiträge; *for Gellert*, K. Biedermann's edition in 30 vols. (Leipzig). — *On Klopstock and the "Göttinger Dichterbund,"* see Bartels, p. 193, and A. Sauer's Göttinger Dichterbund (Kürschner, vol. L); for the poets of the Dichterbund in general, Kürschner, vols. XLIX, L; Prutz, Der Göttinger Dichterbund (1841); and the repository of their literary productions, *Der Musenalmanach*; cf. H. Grantgow, Gesch. des Göttinger und des Vossischen Musenalmanachs (in *Berliner Beiträge*, No. 22. 1909). *On Bürger*, see Bartels, p. 235, and G. B. Maury, Bürger et les origines anglaises de la ballade littéraire en Allemagne (Paris: 1889); also, W. Wackernagel's careful comparative study of Bürger's Lenore (in Haupt and Hoffmann's Blätter, vol. I, pp. 174–204); W. von Wurzbach's G. A. Bürger (1900); H. Pröhle's Bürger, sein Leben und seine Dichtungen (1856); K. Goedeke's Bürger in Göttingen und Gelliehausen (Hannover: 1873), and A. Strodtmann's Briefe von und an Bürger (4 vols. Berlin: 1874). His poems are edited by Tittmann (in Bibl. d. deutsch. Nat.-Litt. d. 18. u. 19. Jahrh., vols. XXI, XXII), and in Kürschner, vol. LXXVIII. *On Stolberg*, see Menge, Graf Stolberg und seine Zeitgenossen; and J. Janssen, F. L., Graf zu Stolberg, u.s.w. (Freiburg: 1877). *On Claudius*, see Mönckeberg, Matthias Claudius (Hamburg: 1869). — *On Klopstock*, see a useful biography by Fr. Muncker (Stuttgart: 1888), and Hamel's edition of his works in Kürschner, vols. XLVI–XLVIII; also G. Liebusch, Ueber das Vaterländische in Klopstocks Oden (Quedlinburg: 1874); J. Schumacher, Klopstock's patriotische Lyrik (Hamm: 1880); E. Schmidt, Beiträge zur Kenntniss der Klopst. Jugendlyrik (in *Quellen und Forsch.*, No. 39. 1880), and J. M. Lappenberg, Briefe von und an Klopstock (1867). — *On the English influence*, consult M. Koch, Ueber die Beziehungen der englischen Literatur zur deutschen im 18. Jahrh. (Leipz.: 1883), and R. Tombo, Ossian in Germany (N.Y.: 1901); and for later developments, Danzel's G. E. Lessing, sein Leben und seine Werke (Leipz.: 1849), and E. Schmidt's Richardson, Rousseau und Goethe (1875). *On the 'Sturm und Drang' period* as a whole, and the close of the century, see Bartels, p. 219 ff., and on the particular authors of the time see Bartels also. For the minor poets of the 'Sturm und Drang' see Kürschner, vols. LXXIX–LXXXI. Two of the latest works on the period are those of Grisebach and Weitbrecht, mentioned by Bartels. *For Wieland's contribution* to the period consult J. G. Grüber's biography (4 vols., 1827–28) and the estimate of his works by J. W. Löbell (Vorlesungen, vol. I). *For Lessing's contribution*, see Fr. Muncker, Lessing's Verhältniss zu Klopstock (Frankf. a. M.: 1880); the Life by Danzel, Guhrauer, and Boxberger (2d ed., 1880), and best of all the biography by E. Schmidt (2 vols., Berlin: 1899). *On Herder*, see Vilmar's Die Genieperiode (Marburg: 1872); R. Haym's excellent Herder (2 vols., Berlin: 1880–1885), and the Life by E. Kühnemann (München: 1895). E. Kircher's Volkslied und Volkspoesie in der Sturm- und Drangzeit (Strassburg: 1903) is helpful. — The student cannot afford to overlook Goethe's Dichtung und Wahrheit, nor its predecessors, Werther and Wilhelm Meister, for in them he will find the best picture gallery of the successive strivings of the Period of Genius.

It seems unnecessary at this point to attempt an account of the mass of critical literature dealing with *Goethe and Schiller*, and the *Classical period* in general. The student will find excellent aid in Bartels, p. 219 ff.: the references on Goethe may be found in the account beginning on p. 245; those on Schiller, p. 312 ff. Goedeke will be of great aid in threading the mazes of bibliography down to 1891. For a condensed and well-chosen guide to works on Goethe, see K. Hoyer, Zur Einführung in der Goethe-Literatur (Gelsenkirchen: 1904). More detailed bibliography for the years since 1880 will be found in the Chronik und Bibliographie of the *Goethe-Jahrbuch*; in the *Berichte des freien deutschen Hochstifts* (Frankfurt); and in the industrious work of F. H. A. Meyer (Verzeichniss einer Goethe-Bibliothek, Leipz.: 1908), which extends the earlier bibliographies of Hirzel down to 1905. For the student the best edition of the poems is the one with commentary, by G. von Loeper (Berlin, Hempel: 1882–84); for advanced investigation, the critical ed. by K. Heinemann (Leipz.: 1901 +), the Weimar edition (about 130 vols.), the Hempel edition (36 vols., Berlin, 1868–79), and Kürschner, and the Cotta edition (40 vols. Stuttgart). The following monographs are cited from the list given by Bartels, p. 283: E. Lichtenberger, Étude sur les poésies lyriques de Goethe (Paris: 1878); T. Achelis, Grundzüge der Lyrik Goethes (Bielefeld: 1900); B. Litzmann, Goethes Lyrik (Berlin: 1903); W. Masing, Sprachliche Musik in Goethes Lyrik (in *Quellen und Forsch.*, No. 108. 1910); A. Kutscher, Das Naturgefühl in Goethes Lyrik (in *Breslauer Beiträge*, No. 8. 1906). Of general works upon Goethe may be mentioned the biography by G. H. Lewes (Lond.: 1856); also, and much better, H. Grimm's Vorlesungen (Berlin: 1876; 8th ed. 1903; trans. by S. H. Adams, Boston: 1879); R. M. Meyer's Goethe (3 vols. 2d ed. Berlin: 1899), and A. Bielschowsky's Goethe (München: 1895–1904; English trans. by W. A. Cooper, N.Y.: 1905–1908). For other 'lives' see C. Thomas' German Literature, p. 420. See also the essays by Carlyle and Matthew Arnold, and J. G. Robertson's Goethe and the Twentieth Century (Camb. Manuals of Sci. and Lit.). — For bibliographies of the Schiller literature besides the Goedeke, see E. Balde, Die Schiller-Literatur in Deutschland, 1781–1851 (Cassel: 1852, 2. Aufl. 1853); L. Unflad, Die Schiller-Literatur in Deutschland, 1781–1877 (München: 1878); M. Koch, Neuere Schiller-Literatur (in the *Frankfurter Hochstiftsberichte*, since 1890); A. Köster (in the *Jahresberichte für neuere deutsche Literaturgeschichte*, since 1892). The poems are issued in many forms, easy of access: among the best may be mentioned Goedeke's (Stuttgart: 1867–76) and the Kürschner. The following monographs are taken from the list in Bartels, p. 332: H. F. W. Hinrichs, Schillers Dichtungen nach ihren historischen Beziehungen und nach ihrem innern Zusammenhang (Leipz.: 1837); H. Viehoff, Schillers Gedichte in allen Beziehungen erläutert (6. Aufl. Stuttgart: 1887); H. Düntzer, Schiller als lyrischer Dichter (Jena: 1864; as Schillers lyrische Gedichte erläutert, 3 Aufl., 1891). For biographies, see that of Calvin Thomas (N.Y.: 1901), those by J. Minor (2 vols. Berlin: 1890) and J. Wychgram (Leipz.: 1898) and others mentioned by Thomas in his German Literature, pp. 420–421. — *For the Protestant hymn*, see Bartels, p. 208. — *On the Epigram*, see E. Urban, Owenus und die deutschen Epigrammatiker des 18. Jahrh. (in *Litthist. Forsch.*, No. 11. 1900); *on Anacreontic verse*, F. Ausfeld, Die deutsche anakreontische Dichtung des 18. Jahrh. (in *Quellen und Forsch.*, No. 101. 1907); T. Feigel, Vom Wesen der Anakreontik (Cassel: 1909); and G. Witkowski, as noted above.

For an illustration of mid-eighteenth-century criticism (mostly historical) of the lyric, see Hagedorn's Sämmtliche Werke (1757), 3 Th., Vorbericht, and Abhandlungen von den Liedern der alten Griechen.

F. *The Nineteenth Century.*

For *bibliography in general*, see Goedeke's Grundriss, vols. VI–VIII; Bartels' Handbuch; Koch and Vogt's Geschichte d. deutsch. Lit., vol. II; the Anmerkungen to Vilmar's Geschichte, pp. 705–711 (which may be supplemented for the later period by the Appendix to Tille's German Songs of To-day, pp. 165–181); R. M. Meyer's Grundriss d. neuern deutsch. Lit.-Geschichte (Berlin: 1902); the *Jahresberichte für neuere deutsche Literaturgeschichte* (1892 +) and Kürschner's Deutscher Literatur-Kalender (Leipzig).

In working with the lyric of this century the student will find very considerable aid in Bartels' Handbuch, where the various movements are kept apart almost too successfully, and in the same author's literary history of this century, cited in the Appendix, which is especially good for the Realistic movement. Bartels maintains he was the first adequately to recognize the importance of this movement by a careful historical treatment. See also R. M. Meyer's Geschichte d. deutsch. Lit. des 19. Jahrh. (Berlin: 1900) — a comprehensive survey. The work by E. Wolff, also cited in the Appendix, treats of the literature of the century by types, which renders it acceptable to the student of the lyric; see also Witkop, as noted at the head of E, above. A. Biese's Lyrische Dichtung und neuere deutsche Lyriker (Berlin: 1896) and A. Tille's Introduction to his German Songs of To-day (N.Y.: 1896) are helpful for the more recent developments. — For further general references, on the Romantic School, Young Germany, etc., see below, under References.

The poets of the century are well represented in the following *anthologies*, to which the student should turn for further information: R. F. Arnold and K. Wagner, Achtzehnhundertneun, Die politische Lyrik des Kriegsjahres (Wien: 1909. *Schr. d. lit. Vereins in Wien*, vol. XI); F. Avenarius, Deutsche Lyrik der Gegenwart seit 1850 (2d ed. Dresden: 1884); M. Bern, Deutsche Lyrik seit Goethe's Tode (11th ed. Leipz.: n.d.); H. Bethge, Deutsche Lyrik seit Liliencron (Leipz.: 1906); B. Gaster, Die deutsche Lyrik in den letzten fünfzig Jahren (Wolfenbüttel: 1905); A. Tille, German Songs of To-day (N.Y.: 1896, — for the lyric of 1881–1896); also other collections by Bartels, A. Stern, Storm, etc. The most general collections are the two mentioned at the head of E, above. Mention should also be made of C. Busse's series, Neue deutsche Lyriker (Paquet, Holst, Hesse, Weise).

During the first third of the century, and contemporaneous with the full summer of Goethe and Schiller, the Romantic movement flourished. It was the outcome not only of forces that had produced the 'Storm and Stress,' viz., Herder and the rest, but of the creative suggestiveness of Goethe's most artistic work, of the idealism of Fichte, and of the mystery and symbolism, the perfection of emotional expression, that the founders of the movement (between 1796 and 1804) — A. W. and Friedrich von Schlegel, Novalis, and Tieck — imagined they had discovered in the life and poetry of the Middle Ages. Of this movement Hölderlin, Tieck, and F. von Hardenberg (Novalis) were the immediate lyrists. With the war of liberation against Napoleon the patriotic lyric added its note to Romanticism: see K. T. Körner, E. M. Arndt, M. von Schenkendorf, Rückert, Follen, et al. — Von Arnim, Brentano, Görres, W. Müller, and Uhland were concerned with the revival of national popular song, and their influence was great and far-reaching. Chamisso and Eichendorff became especially famous as sentimental lyric poets. Lenau (von Strehlenau) was the leader of the Austrian contingency. Goethe's West-östlicher Divan, and the poems of Friedrich Rückert, Platen, Bodenstedt, and others, showed the influence of the oriental studies of Hammer-Purgstall. In the work of all these poets the student will find the characteristics of romantic lyrism abundantly illustrated, — its prevailing vagueness, its spirit of revolt, its *Sehnsucht*, its medievalism, its patriotic fervor, its mysticism and orientalism, its popular strain, its fatalism, etc. — Somewhat less directly connected with the Romantic movement are Tiedge and von Stägemann, whose inspiration was from the Prussian school of Gleim, Ramler, and Kleist; and the descriptive poets F. von Matthisson and the Freiherr von Salis-Sewis, who derive partly from Kleist, partly from Bodmer and Klopstock.

The revolt against the extravagance of the Romanticists, about 1835, goes by the name of 'Young Germany.' Its concern was largely with radicalism in political and practical affairs. It turned to contemporary French literature for its models. The most distinguished adherent of the school was Heine, whose lyrics at once achieved a European reputation. Here, too, should be considered the political and social poetry of Becker, Grün, Herwegh, von Fallersleben, Schneckenburger, Prutz, Freiligrath, Geibel, R. Gottschall, Scherr, W. Jordan, etc. — The realistic and new-classic reactions against Young Germany are by some regarded as producing the master poetry of the century; but these movements, and the new-romantic and the later naturalistic, decadent, and symbolistic movements, are too near our own times to render systematic study of them very successful, however interesting and stimulating.

The most important writers of lyrics in the middle of the century were Geibel, whose resuscitation of the manner of the early folk song and of the Minnesingers in perfection of melodious form is more vital than his contribution to political poetry, — and Hebbel, whose yearning after pure beauty and utterance of the fateful problem of life echo the philosophy of Schopenhauer. With Geibel should be studied E. Mörike, T. Storm, and J. von Scheffel, as poets following the earlier romantic tradition; and the aesthetic and hedonistic verse writers of the Munich group of the fifties and sixties who acknowledged Geibel as their head, — F. Bodenstedt, Paul Heyse, and others. With Hebbel should be considered Storm, again, in his pessimistic mood, and the later lyric disciples of Schopenhauer, — W. Jensen, E. Grisebach, H. Leuthold, etc. The reaction against the pessimism with which Darwin's doctrines of evolution affected many is noticeable in the lyrics of W. Jordan (1871), and it may be traced in the optimism, based not upon religious belief but upon science, expressed in the poetry of younger writers, especially Arno Holz and J. Grosse. The realism of romantic lyric poets of the older generation, Gottfried Keller (b. 1819), F. T. Vischer (b. 1807), J. G. Fischer (b. 1816), assumed under the philosophical influence of Nietzsche and Ernst Haeckel the modern utilitarian and impressionistic aspect presented, from 1882 on, in the lyrics of Nietzsche himself, of Julius and Heinrich Hart, of Holz, again, and Grosse, Hermann Conradi, K. Henckell, William Arent, O. E. Hartleben, Richard Dehmel, and J. G. Oswald. Other poets of recent years whom the student may take pleasure in reading and classifying are G. Falke, F. Avenarius, F. Evers, J. Schlaf, K. Bleibtreu; perhaps, also, O. J. Bierbaum, R. Waldmüller, Otto and A. W. Ernst, Ada Christen, and a score more whom he will find represented in collections such as Tille's German Songs.

Texts and References. For *texts* of individual authors, see Bartels; it is unnecessary to give here a list of editions that can easily be made up from the library catalogue of any large university. — The student's main concern will be with the various aspects of the *Romantic school* in both its earlier and later manifestations, and in that interest some of the works following should not escape his attention. — H. Hettner's Die romantische Schule in ihrem Zusammenhange mit Goethe und Schiller (Braunschweig: 1850) is the earliest production of critical impartiality on the subject; the same author treats of the beginnings of the movement in his Literaturgeschichte des 18. Jahrh., cited in the Appendix. R. Haym's Die romantische Schule (Berlin: 1870) is the standard history of the movement in its earlier phases; see also S. Born's Die romantische Schule in Deutschland und Frankreich (Heidelberg: 1879). Enlightening criticism will be found in the second volume of G. Brandes' Main Currents in Nineteenth Century Literature (English translation, N.Y.: 1902). I. Rouge has a commendable study in his F. Schlegel et la genèse du romantisme allemand, 1791–1797 (Paris: 1904); see also the two works by R. Huch, Blütezeit der Romantik (Leipz.: 1899), and Ausbreitung und Verfall der Romantik (Leipz.: 1902). Marie Joachimi's Die Weltanschauung der deutschen Romantik (Jena und Leipz.: 1905) is suggestive, and C. E. Vaughan's The Romantic Revolt presents the subject in broad perspective. Heine's Romantische Schule is, of course, polemical. — *On F. von Hardenberg*, see E. A. L. Bauer's Novalis als religiöser Dichter (Leipz.: 1877); *on Tieck*, W. Miessner, L. Tiecks Lyrik (in *Litthist. Forsch.*, No. 24. 1902), Rud. Köpke's Ludwig Tieck: Erinnerungen u.s.w. (2 vols. Leipz.: 1855), and the Freiherr von Friesen's L. Tieck: Erinnerung eines alten Freundes, 1825–1842 (2 vols., Wien: 1874); *on Rückert*, C. Beyer's Friedrich Rückert (Frankfurt: 1868); *on Platen*, H. Tschersig, Das Gasel in der deut. Dichtung und bei Platen (in *Breslauer Beiträge z. Litgesch.*, No. 11. 1907); *on E. M. Arndt*, his autobiography, Erinnerungen aus dem äusseren Leben (1840); *on L. A. von Arnim*, W. Grimm's Einleitung to the Werke (19 vols. Berlin: 1839); *on Brentano*, the studies by J. B. Heinrich (Köln: 1878) and J. B. Diel (Freiburg: 1878); *on W. Müller*, the introduction by Max Müller to his father's poems (Bibliothek d. deutsch. Nationalliteratur, vol. XVII), and P. S. Allen, W. Müller and the German Volkslied (in *Jr. Germ. Phil.*, 3: 35. 1901); *for Uhland's views*, his Schriften zur Geschichte der Dichtung und Sage (8 vols., Stuttg.: 1865 +); *on Chamisso*, the life and letters in vols. V, VI of his Werke (1838); *on Eichendorff*, Werke, vol. VI (Leipz.: 1864), and J. Nadler, Eichendorffs Lyrik (in

Prager deutsche Studien, No. 10. 1908). For the other 'Romantics' see the bibliographies and collections listed at the beginning of these references. — A very considerable portion of the criticism dealing with the movements of this century is contained in literary periodicals, which the advanced student should never fail to consult. Such an article, for instance, as W. Miessner's Ludwig Tiecks Lyrik (in *Literarhistorische Forschungen*, No. 24. Berlin: 1902) is of undoubted importance in establishing a more intimate acquaintance with the early romantic lyric. — On other phases of Romanticism, especially those of later appearance, little of impartial critical worth exists. The student must be on his guard against works of *Tendenz* and visionary purpose that assume historical-sounding titles. Works by Arno Holz, for instance, are feverish symptoms of the time, and only confusing if taken otherwise. Compare E. Seillière, L'influence française dans la litt. allemande contemporaine [Arno Holz] (in *Rev. d. D. M.* 15 avril 1900). J. J. Honegger's Das deutsche Lied der Neuzeit (Leipz.: 1891) is quite popular in character. The following are interesting and stimulating: O. Ewald (Friedländer), Die Probleme der Romantik als Grundfragen der Gegenwart (Berlin: 1904); O. Floeck, as noted above, § 5; K. Joel, Nietzsche und die Romantik (Jena und Leipz.: 1905); E. Kircher, Philosophie der Romantik (Jena: 1906).

On Young Germany, see Bartels' Handbuch; J. Proelss, Das Junge Deutschland (Stuttgart: 1892); the sixth volume of Brandes' Main Currents. The poetic qualities of *Heine* are vividly portrayed in the impartial and yet sympathetic estimate of Matthew Arnold (Essays in Criticism). For further discussion of his lyric genius, see the Leben by A. Strodtmann (2 vols. Berlin: 1867–69), and by Hermann Hüffer (Berlin: 1878), and R. Prölss' Heinrich Heine (Stuttg.: 1886), A. W. Fischer's Ueber die volkstüm. Elemente in den Gedichten Heines (in *Beiträge z. deut. Litwissensch.*, No. 15. 1905), and F. Melchior's Heines Verhältniss zu Byron (in *Litthist. Forsch.*, No. 27. 1903). For references bearing on Heine's influence in France, see Betz-Baldensperger, La littérature comparée, Essai bibliographique, III, 3, pp. 42–79 (2d ed. Strasbourg: 1904). For other lyrists of Young Germany, and of the mid-century, Freiligrath, Geibel, Hebbel, Bodenstedt, Heyse, etc., see the anthologies, collections, and bibliographies mentioned above. P. Zincke's F. Hebbels philosophische Jugendlyrik (in *Prager deutsche Studien*, No. 11. 1908) will interest the student of the reflective lyric.

For the pessimistic lyric following in the train of Schopenhauer, read E. Grisebach's poems in Der neue Tannhäuser (1869; Berlin: 1888) and J. Bächtold's edition of Heinrich Leuthold's Gedichte (Frauenfeld:

1878) and K. E. Franzos' *Deutsche Dichtung*, vol. I (Stuttgart: 1886). — For Darwin's influence and *the lyric of scientific optimism*, read Wilhelm Jordan's Strophen und Stäbe (Frankf. a. M.: 1871), his Andachten (Frankf. a. M.: 1877), and Arno Holz's Das Buch der Zeit (Zürich: 1886). — *For Nietzsche* and the social realism of modern life, the student will consult his Werke (Leipz.: 1895) in general, especially his Jenseits von Gut und Böse, and the Gedichte in vols. V, VI, and VIII; K. Joel's Nietzsche und die Romantik (mentioned above); H. and J. Hart's Kritische Waffengänge (1882); the lyrics contained in Jungdeutschland (Conradi and Henckell, Berlin and Leipz.: 1886), and the periodicals of realism and impressionism: Conradi and Bleibtreu's *Die Gesellschaft* (Leipz.: 1885 +), L. M. Kafka's *Moderne Dichtung* (Leipz., Brünn, Wien: 1890; in 1891 *Moderne Rundschau*), K. E. Franzos' *Deutsche Dichtung*, Brahm and Bölsche's *Freie Bühne* (Berlin: 1890 +; since 1894 *Neue Deutsche Rundschau*); also the lyrics of other Nietzschean poets — Hermann Conradi (Lieder eines Sünders, Leipz.: 1887), Dehmel (Aber die Liebe, München: 1893), Grosse (Buch der Erinnerungen, Strassburg: 1895), etc.

On contemporary poetry, see O. E. Lessing, Masters in Modern German Literature (Dresden: 1912), and A. Sorgel, Dichtung und Dichter der Zeit: eine Schilderung der deutsch. Lit. der letzten Jahrzehnte (Leipz.: 1911).

On German *patriotic poetry*, see the references under Klopstock, above (*Eighteenth Century*), and A. Baldi, Das deutschpatriotische nationale Lied, etc., 1813–70 (Bamberg: 1871); E. G. O. Fritsche, Die franz. Kriegslyrik des Jahres 1870 in ihrem Verhältniss zur gleichzeitigen deutschen (Progr. Zwickau: 1899); G. Huyssen, Die Poesie des Krieges und die Kriegspoesie (Berlin: 1883); K. Janicke, Das deutsche Kriegslied (Berlin: 1871); C. Petzet, Die Blütezeit der deutschen politischen Lyrik von 1840–50 (München: 1903); O. Weddingen, Die patriotische Dichtung von 1870–71, etc. (Leipz.: 1880).

G. *The German Hymn.*

A good introduction to German hymnody is at hand in Miss Winkworth's Christian Singers of Germany (Lond.: 1869). Lord Selborne's article on Hymns (mentioned above, under the fourth division of this section, viz., Christian Greek and Latin Hymns of M. A.; also published separately, under same title, Lond.: 1892) is based, in that part which treats of German hymns, upon Miss Winkworth's monograph. The principal authorities are as follows: H. von Fallersleben, Geschichte des deutschen Kirchenliedes bis auf Luthers Zeit (3d ed.

Hannover: 1861), which contains many selections from the German hymns; K. Goedeke and J. Tittmann, Deutsche Dichter des 17. Jahrhunderts; P. Wackernagel, Das deutsche Kirchenlied von der ältesten Zeit bis zu Anfang des 17. Jahrh. (5 vols. in 6. Leipz.: 1864–76), a standard collection, with historical material; A. Fischer and W. Tümpel, Das deutsche evangelische Kirchenlied des 17. Jahrh. (5 vols., Gütersloh: 1904–11); B. C. Roosen, Das evangelische Trostlied, u.s.w., um die Zeit des dreissigjährigen Krieges (Dresden: 1862); J. Mützell, Geistliche Lieder der evangelischen Kirche aus dem 16. Jahrh. (3 vols. Berlin: 1855), with a chronological table that is valuable; by the same, a work of similar title for the seventeenth and first half of the eighteenth centuries (Braunschweig: 1858); E. E. Koch and R. Lauxmann, Geschichte des Kirchenlieds und Kirchengesangs der christlichen, insbesondere der deutschen evangelischen Kirche (3d ed. 8 vols. Stuttgart: 1866–76); W. Bäumker, Das katholische deutsche Kirchenlied, etc. (3 vols. Freib.: 1886–91), — with an excellent bibliography; Cunz, Geschichte des deutschen Kirchenliedes (Leipz.: 1855); W. Nelle, Gesch. des deutschen evangelischen Kirchenliedes (2d ed. Hamburg: 1909). For the older collections of Baron von Bunsen, and for English versions of the German hymns, see Lord Selborne's article.

H. *German Popular Poetry.*

For a long list of works upon Volkslieder and collections of Volkslieder, see Paul's Grundriss, 2d ed., II, 1, p. 1178 ff. (notices of the ballads in the same, pp. 49–62, 69, 299, 385); for a brief note on the Schnaderhüpfl, see above, under C. Rotter, § 5. Among the collections, Arnim and Brentano's Des Knaben Wunderhorn (various editions) is important historically, as are also Uhland's Volkslieder and R. von Liliencron's Die historischen Volkslieder (13th to 16th centuries. 4 vols. Leipz.: 1865–69). Other large and intrinsically important collections are F. M. Böhme's Altdeutsches Liederbuch (12th to 17th centuries. Leipz.: 1877), L. Erk's Deutscher Liederhort (all periods; ed. by F. M. Böhme. 3 vols. Leipz.: 1893–94), Böhme's Volksthümliche Lieder (18th to 19th centuries. Leipz.: 1895), and A. Hartmann's Historische Volkslieder (16th to 19th centuries. 2 + vols. München: 1907 +), and the collections already indicated in the References to D, Early New High German Period, above. See also Georg Förster's Sammlung, Ein Auszug guter alter und neuer teutscher Liedlein (Nurmb.: 1539–40), Oegier's Sammlung of 1512, Tittmann's Liederbuch des 16. Jahrh., Karl von Erlach's Volkslieder der Deutschen, Joseph Bergmann's Das Ambraser Liederbuch vom Jahre 1582 (in Stuttgarter Literarischer Verein: 1845).

XIV. The Dutch Lyric.

For histories of Dutch literature see the Appendix. Gosse's article, Dutch Lit., in the Encyc. Brit., 11th ed., furnishes an introduction for the English student; those who read German may use L. Schneider's Gesch. der niederländ. Lit. (Leipz.: 1887). For the earlier period, to the 17th century, a very helpful guide is Jan te Winkel's Niederländische Literatur (in Paul's Grundriss, II, 1): see especially Chap. V Die Lyrik des 12. bis 14. Jahrh., and Chap. XI Die Lyrik des 15. und 16. Jahrh. For bibliography of the folk-song of Holland, see Paul, II, 1, p. 1178 ff. — Dr. John Bowring's Batavian Anthology (Lond.: 1824) will prove an excellent introduction; the preface should be studied. Of this work Longfellow in his Remarks on the Dutch Language and Poetry, in Poets, etc. of Europe, makes use. An article in the *Foreign Quart. Rev.* 14: 164, should be consulted; it is the earliest form of Bowring's Sketch of the Language and Literature of Holland (afterwards publ. 1829, Amsterd.). Standard collections of Dutch verse are Blommaert's Oudvlaemsche Gedichte der XII^e^, XIII^e^ en XIV^e^ Eeuwen (Ghent: 1838–41); and Hoffmann von Fallersleben's Niederländische Volkslieder (1856).

Aside from early translations of the Psalms, from folk songs, ballads, and hymns, from the poems of Maerlant (*c.* 1230–1290) and of Dirk Potter in the beginning of the fifteenth century, and a few remains of minstrelsy, and poetic snatches in the miracle plays and other productions of the medieval guilds, the Dutch lyric offers little before 1540 to attract the student. — From that time on to the end of the sixteenth century, collections of psalms, hymns, folk-songs, and of songs and ballads of patriotism were issued. The more important lyric poets were Anna Bijns and Filips van Marnix. As a refiner of style and a humanist, rather than as a poet, D. V. Coornhert (1522–1590) deserves attention; so, also, Spieghel and R. P. Visscher. — During the seventeenth century the disciples of Visscher in Amsterdam assert themselves in many kinds of artistic literature — history, romance, drama, epic, satire, pastoral, reflective poem, the pure lyric, and the ode. The masters of this creative period, in whose works the student of lyrical poetry will find his best material, were P. C. Hooft

(1581–1647), G. A. Brederoo (1585–1618), J. J. Starter (*fl.* 1614–1625), Constantijn Huygens (1596–1687), and the most distinguished of Dutch poets, the dramatist Joost van den Vondel (1587–1679). In one and another of these — all of the Amsterdam school — the inspiration of the classics, the Italian renaissance, and the French to some extent, and very decidedly of the great Elizabethans, may be traced. Apart from them stood the didactic poet, Jakob Cats of Middleburg. Of the younger generation may be mentioned Luiken and Jonctijs. — The first two thirds of the eighteenth century was the period of French influence and pseudo-classicism. The only lyric poets worth recording here are H. C. Poot, W. van Haren, and the Baroness de Lannoy. The end of the century witnessed the inrush of romanticism. Its most forceful opponent was Willem Bilderdijk (1756–1831), a disciple of the English Augustan school, impressive as a didactic poet and vastly influential in the poetry of formal rule. The first popular novelist and poet of the romantic school was R. Feith (1753–1824). — During the first half of the nineteenth century the more eminent lyrists, all romantic in spirit and manner, were Hendrik Tollens (1780–1856), Adrianus Bogaers (1795–1870), A. C. W. Staring (1767–1840), E. J. Potgieter (1808–75), and P. A. de Genestet (1829–61). For further particulars, see Gosse's Studies and his article in the Encyc. Brit.

Texts. For *Hooft*, the edition of his poetical works and dramas by P. Leendertz (2 vols., 1871–75); *for Brederoo*, his works edited by J. ten Brink (3 vols. 1885–90), ten Brink's biography, Brederoo (Utrecht: 1859, 3d ed. 1887–88), and J. H. W. Unger's Brederoo, eine Bibliographie (1884); *for Huygens*, his De vita propria sermones (ed. 1827), and his Corn Flowers (eds. 1658, 1672); *for Vondel*, his odes and the lyrical passages in his tragedies, especially Lucifer (1654), see translation by C. L. van Norden (Greensboro, N.C.: 1917). Vondel's complete works have been edited by van Lennep (12 vols. 1850–69), revised by J. H. W. Unger (1888–94). Unger has also published a bibliography (1888) of Vondel. — See also below, § 12, XII, and for bibliography of the earlier poets, Jan te Winkel, as noted above.

XV. The Scandinavian Lyric in General.

On the *Scandinavian Lyric in general* see P. Schweitzer's Gesch. der scandinavischen Litt. (3 parts. Leipz.: 1886–89); E. W. Gosse's Studies in the Literature of Northern Europe (Lond.: 1879), which treat of certain poets of Norway, Sweden, Denmark, Germany, and Holland. A somewhat systematic account of the Northern literatures, with occasional reference to national songs, is to be found in William and Mary Howitt's Literature and Romance of Northern Europe (2 vols. Lond.: 1852), which deals chiefly with the literatures of Sweden, Norway, Denmark, and Iceland. Other works to be consulted are Frederick Metcalf's The Englishman and the Scandinavian (Boston: 1880); Rasmus B. Anderson's translation of F. W. Horn's History of the Literature of the Scandinavian North (Chicago: 1884; also 1895; the bibliography by Thorwald Solberg of English works on Scandinavian is a mine of information); E. Kölbing's Beiträge zur vergl. Gesch. d. romant. Poesie u. s. w. des Mittelalters unter besond. Berücksichtigung der Engl. in nordischen Literatur (Breslau: 1876); E. Magnusson and W. Morris' Story of the Volsungs and Niblungs, p. 165 Certain Songs from the Elder Edda (trans. Lond.: 1870). For exhaustive bibliography of Scandinavian Folk-songs, see Paul's Grundriss (1901), II, 1, p. 1135 ff.; for references on versification, see Gayley and Scott, pp. 513–514.

XVI. The Icelandic Lyric.

In tracing the lyric element through Icelandic poetry, consult for brief introductions the article Iceland in the Encyc. Brit., 11th ed., and the admirable little volume by W. A. Craigie, The Icelandic Sagas (Camb. Manuals of Sc. and Lit.). F. W. Horn's work, referred to above, under XV, is the most useful guide in English not only to the lyric but to the general poetry of Iceland. For the earlier periods, up to the 17th century, E. Mogk's Norwegisch-isländische Lit., with its bibliographical aids, is indispensable (in Paul's Grundriss (1901), II, 1, p. 555 ff.), as is also G. Vigfusson's outline of the classic period in his Prolegomena to Sturlunga Saga (Oxford: 1879). See also the best work in its field, F. Jónsson's Den Oldnorske og Oldislanske Litteraturs Historie (Copenhagen: 1893–1900), and compare below, under the Epic, § 12, XIII. For modern poetry see C. Küchler, Gesch. der isländischen Dichtung der Neuzeit (Leipz.: 1896); J. C. Poestion, Isländische Dichter der Neuzeit (Leipz.: 1897). For notices of works that have appeared since 1879 see the *Jahresbericht über die*

Erschein. auf dem Gebiet der germ. Philol., 1880 ff. — Among *texts and collections*, consult first of all Vigfusson and Powell's Corpus Poeticum Boreale (Oxford: 1883), and B. Sijmons' Die Lieder der Edda (in *German. Handbib.* VIII, 3. Halle a. S.: 1906); for editions of the epic literature see below, § 12. For the ballads of Iceland see a collection by Grundtvig and Jón Sigurðsson (1854–85).

XVII. **The Swedish Lyric.**

See first the general history of Swedish poetry, pp. 289–378 of F. W. Horn's work, mentioned above; then, Gosse's article on Swedish literature in the Encyc. Brit.; Longfellow's Sketch in his Poets and Poetry of Europe; H. Schück, Svensk literaturhistoria (1885 etc.), and the brief article, Schwedisch-dänische Lit., in Paul's Grundriss (1901); Schück and Warburg, Illustrerad svensk literaturhistoria (1896); P. A. Sondén's Bibliographisk öfversigt öfver svenska vitterheten (1810–1832); L. Hammarsköld's Svenska vitterheten, andra upplagen öfversedd af Sondén (Stockh.: 1833); B. E. Malmström's Grunddragen af svenska vitterhetens historia (Örebro: 1866–68); Notice sur la littérature et les beaux arts en Suède par Marianne d'Ehrenström (Stockh.: 1826); Howitt's Literature of Northern Europe; Schweitzer's Gesch. der scandinav. Litt.; and Gosse's Studies. For collections of ballads and Swedish lyrics, see P. Hanselli, Samlade vitterhetsarbeten af svenska författere från Stjernhjelm till Dalin (Upsala: 1856), L. Pineau, Les vieux chants populaires scandinaves (1898); collections by Geijer and Afzelius (1814–16, 1880) and Arwidsson (1834–42); Longfellow's Poets, etc. of Europe. The bibliographical appendix to Horn's History mentioned above supplies the necessary references to literary histories and the texts of the various authors. Gosse mentions also (Encyc. Brit.) P. Wieselgren, Sveriges sköna literatur; Warburg, Svensk litteraturhistoria i sammandrag.

The Swedish lyric of the Middle Ages, 1200–1500, was apparently limited to the folk song, which in common with the Danish-Norwegian had its origins in old Scandinavian mythical and poetic materials. The forms in which they have been transmitted are of the 14th, 15th, and 16th centuries. Nicholaus Hermanni (d. 1391) and Tomas (d. 1443) wrote poems after the fashion of the folk song: the latter, called the first Swedish poet, one on Freedom, one on Truth, and a famous song of the national hero — Engelbrekt.

During the sixteenth century the chief contributions to lyric poetry were the sacred songs of the Petri brothers, Olaus and Laurentius, theologians of the Reformation.

About the beginning of the seventeenth century the secular lyric echoing the folk-song appears in the historical dramas of Messenius (1579–1636). The most important figure in the literature of this century was Georg Stjernhjelm (1598–1672), the founder of Swedish poetics and the 'Father of Swedish Poetry.' As the apostle of humanistic culture, he occupies a position analogous to that of his contemporary in Germany, Opitz. His masques are musical with airy lyrics; and the comic-lyric style of his Epithalamium in hexameters, The Inconveniences of Wedding, set the pace for Swedish writers of humorous verse. In opposition to the formal classicism of Stjernhjelm's poetics a younger poet, Gustaf Rosenhane (1619–84), a disciple of the Second Silesian School of German poetry, wrote his Thet svenska språketz klagemål (The Complaint of the Swedish Tongue), and in his sonnets of the Venerid exemplified the influence not only of Lohenstein but of Italian models. Among the more important followers of Stjernhjelm were the 'Swedish Flaccus' Samuel Columbus, whose odes are written in hexameter form, and Peter Lagerlöf, who composed erotic songs. Eurelius Dahlstjerna, on the other hand, with the ottava rima of his epic poetry and the Marinisms of his more lyric verse, was an adherent of Rosenhane and the Second Silesian School. In the poetry of religious songs the best work of the erratic Lars Lucidor deserves attention, and the church hymns of Svedberg and Bishop Spegel.

The eighteenth century opened with the idyllic and elegiac poems of Jacob Frese, true to nature and graceful in form, and his religious verses replete with emotion. The dominating force in poetry of the first half of the century was, however, the pseudo-classic, derived from French masters of the Illumination and from the Augustan school in England of Addison, Pope, etc. The most distinguished literary figure of the period was Olof von Dalin (1708–63). In epic, drama, and prose, Dalin is *simplex* *munditiis*, facile in diction, keen of wit, governed by foreign culture. In some of his lyrics, however, he escaped formalism and reproduced the artlessness of the folk song. The influence, also pseudo-classical, of his younger contemporary, Fru Nordenflycht, who wrote charming and pathetic lyrics, was even more cast in favor of French models and mannerisms. Her most distinguished follower, G. F. Creutz, was the most genuine and successful idyllic poet of the period. His Atis och Camilla (about 1760) reaches the high-water mark of sentiment, fancy, and graceful execution. The more native manner of the folk song persisted, meanwhile, and is to be found in Anders Odel's Song of Malcolm Sinclair (1739). — The second literary period of the eighteenth century, the Gustavian, begins about 1765, shortly before the accession of Gustavus III, and includes the first decade of the next century. It was characterized in lyric as in other poetry by two distinct tendencies — the National and the Academic. At the head of the national group of poets was the most original and spontaneous of Swedish lyrists, Karl Mikael Bellman (1740–95), the 'Anacreon of the North,' a dithyrambic improvisatore of the foremost rank. At first a follower of Dalin, in 1765 he gave rein to his native popular and lyrical bent, and during the succeeding twenty years produced in such works as the Epistles and Songs of Fredman the most tuneful and unfettered, homely and humorous, pathetic and idyllic poetry of the common people that Sweden has known. Of the academic movement, on the other hand, the leader was J. H. Kellgren (1751–95), as aesthetician and critic a continuator of the rational and formal French influence, the Gottsched of Sweden; but, as a writer of lyrics and lyrical dramas, distinguished by inspiration and hearty emotion as well as polish and wit. Among the best of his lyrical poems are The New Creation and To Christina. The associate and successor of Kellgren in the academic group, K. G. af Leopold, a dramatist and satirist who lived until 1829, contributed to the formation of literary taste rather by his aesthetic criticism than by genuine lyrical creativity. To another associate, Anna Maria Lenngren, Swedish poetry is indebted for idyllic poems charming in vivacity and truthful to the facts of common life. — The end of the century witnessed the preparation for the Romantic movement in the work of two writers: Bengt Lidner (1759–93), who during his youth had come under the sway of the German romantics, and whose lyrical and elegiac poems display a wealth of fancy and exaggerated sentiment; and Tomas Thorild, who, from 1791 on, principally by his contributions to poetics, written in opposition to the formalism of the academic group and in glorification of 'genius,' familiarized Sweden with the doctrines of Rousseau and the poetry of Klopstock and the Ossianic fragments. Meanwhile, by the graceful lyric and idyllic poems of Franzén (1772–1847), the taste and manner of the school of Kellgren were carried well into the period of the new poetry.

The Romantic period was inaugurated during the first and second decades of the nineteenth century by the Phosphorists, admirers of Hardenberg, Tieck, and the Schlegels. Of the Phosphorists, the most brilliant and spontaneous in lyric verse, as well as the ablest in criticism, was Atterbom (1790–1855); among the less distinguished, but still worthy of the student's attention, were Dahlgren, Julia Nyberg, and the hymnodist Hedborn. Less directly connected with the school of Atterbom, but of surprising freshness as romantic lyrists, were the author of the mystical religious cycle, Lilies in Sharon, Stagnelius, one of the most original geniuses of Swedish poetry, and Vitalis (Sjöberg), humorous, profoundly elegiac, and religious by turns. — To the Gothic League founded by Geijer and some of his friends, in 1811, for the revival of interest in ancient Scandinavian history and literature, the romantic lyric owes even more than to the Phosphorists. The native element imbues the songs and hymns of Geijer and the lyrics of Ling, and, also, the masterpieces of their associate in the Gothic League, Esaias Tegnér (1782–1846), — the most popular of Swedish poets, and one of the two or three most eminent. To the lyrical episodes in his idyl, Children at their First Communion, and of his epoch-making Frithiofs-saga, one should turn for an especially artistic expression of the national consciousness in lyrical form. In his successor as poet of the nation, Johan Ludvig Runeberg (1804–77), a writer of like eminence in several respects, the student will perhaps recognize a lyrist of more varied range and of even finer inspiration and finish. In realistic and graceful simplicity Runeberg's idyllic epics, Christmas Eve and The Elk-hunters, have not been surpassed in Swedish poetry. B. E. Malmström, with his elegies, ballads, and lyrics — few, but noteworthy; K. V. Böttiger, with his sentimentalism; A. D. von Braun, with his humorous lyrics; Strandberg, "Orvar Odd" (O. P. Sturzen-Becker), and other minor poets fill out the lyrism of the first half of the century. The historical fiction and the graceful and patriotic lyrics of the Finn, Zakris Topelius (1818–98), have been most popular. Last of the romanticists and idealists was Viktor Rydberg (1828–95), and with him, as standing in opposition to the violent realism, naturalism, and Nietzscheism (1878 ff.) of J. A. Strindberg (b. 1849) and his followers, we may associate C. D. af Wirsén (b. 1842) and Carl Snoilsky (1841–1903). Snoilsky's plenteous vein is instinct with youth, beauty, and the joy of living. Of the lyrists of the pessimistic and naturalistic movement A. U. Bååth (b. 1853) was preëminent. But the lyrics of O. Levertin, E. Kléen, and G. Fröding are rich and sensuous in imagery and harmony, and Verner von Heidenstam's romantic idealism is a telling protest against the coarse realism of the Strindbergians.

Texts and References. *On Stjernhjelm* see Hanselli's Samlade vitterhetsarbeten, mentioned above (Upsala: 1856); *on Dalin*, the same, and E. W. Lindblad's O. v. Dalin's valda skrifter (1872). On the literary societies of Dalin's time, see G. Göthe's Historisk öfversigt af de vittra samfunden i Sverige före svenska Akademiens stiftelse (Stockholm: 1875). *For Bellman*, see the editions by J. G. Carlén (Stockholm: 1856–61), and C. Eichhorn (Stockholm: 1876–77); also G. Ljunggren's edition of Fredman's Epistles (Lond.: 1867). *On Kellgren*, see the edition by Regnér and Lengblom (last ed., Örebro: 1860), also C. W. Böttiger in *Transactions of the Swedish Academy* (vol. XLV, 1870); G. Ljunggren's Kellgren, Leopold, och Thorild (1873) and his Svenska vitterhetens häfder (1877); Wieselgren's Sveriges sköna literatur (1833–49) and Atterbom's Svenska siare och skalder (1841–55). For *Atterbom*, his Samlade dikter (Örebro: 1854–63); his Samlade skrifter i obunden stil (Örebro: 1859–1864) and the files of the *Fosforus* (1810–1813). *On the Gothic League*, R. Hjärne's Götiska forbundet och dess hufvudmän (Stockholm: 1878). *For Geijer*, his Samlade skrifter (1873–76); his Minnen (1834); S. A. Holländer's Minne af E. G. Geijer (1869); and Malmström in his Tal och esthetiska afhandlingar (1868). For *Tegnér*, his Samlade skrifter (Stockholm: 1876); Böttiger's Teckning af Tegnér's Lefnad; G. Brandes' Esaias Tegnér; and Thomander, Tankar och Löjen. *On Runeberg*, Nyblom's introduction to the Samlade skrifter (1873–76). See Gosse's Studies in Lit. North. Europe for nearly all these poets.

XVIII. **The Danish-Norwegian Lyric.**

The histories of Danish and Norwegian poetry are given in the Appendix. As introductions the student will use Gosse's articles in the Encyc. Brit., 11th ed.; the proper sections of Horn's history, already noted, in the bibliographical appendix of which there is a list of texts and literary-historical studies; the popular account in W. and M. Howitt's Lit. of Northern Europe; and the suggestive sections in Longfellow's Poets of Europe. See also other general histories of Scandinavian literature mentioned above, under XV. H. Schück's Schwedisch-dänische Lit., and E. Mogk's Norwegisch-isländische Lit., both dealing with the earlier periods (to the 17th century), and both contained in Paul's Grundriss (1901), are well supplied with critical apparatus. Brandes' Kritiker og Portraiter (1870) and his Danske Digtere (1877) are helpful, as are also the articles on the various authors in Ersch and Gruber's Allgemeine Encycl. On Danish ballads see A. Olrik, Danske Folkeviser i Udvalg (Copenh.: 1899). — General *collections* of songs and ballads are the Udvalgte Danske Viser, fra Midten af det 16de Aarhundrede til henimod Midten af det 18de, met Melodier (2 vols. Copenh.: 1821); Abrahamson, Nyerup and Rahbek's Udvalgte Danske Viser fra Middelalderen (5 vols. Copenh.: 1812–14); Thiele's Danske Folkesagn (9 vols. Copenh.: 1820–23). The most comprehensive is Sv. Grundtvig's Danmarks gamle Folkeviser (5 vols. Copenh.: 1853–1890), continued by A. Olrik as Danske Ridderviser, 1895 +. The Norwegian ballads have been collected by Landstad (1853) and S. Bugge (1858). For translations of the more famous ballads, and of certain lyrics of Kingo, Tullin, Ewald, Storm, Oehlenschläger, Ingemann, and others, see Longfellow's Collection; also, R. C. A. Prior, Ancient Danish Ballads (3 vols. Lond.: 1860).

A. *Danish-Norwegian poetry*, which extends from about 1500 to the beginning of the nineteenth century, bears in the Middle Ages practically the same relation to the Icelandic origins as does the Swedish. Till the period of the Reformation it is composed exclusively of ballad and folk song. — In the beginning of the sixteenth century, the Biblical translator Pedersen made possible a new national lyric by his creation of a literary language and by his cultivation of the earlier folk material. He was, however, not a lyrist; and, save for a crude growth of psalmody and the more individual hymnody of the Rose-Garland of the Virgin Mary by the priest Mikkel of Odense (publ. 1514–15) and of Hans Sthen (1544–1603), the student will find nothing of moment until the appearance in 1591 of the famous collection and recension of the old ballads by A. S. Vedel.

In the seventeenth century the modern era begins. It is ushered in by Anders Arrebo (1587–1637), the 'Father of Danish Poetry.' His contributions to the lyric are to be found principally in his metrical translation of the Psalms and his didactic epic, the Hexaëmeron, the latter of which occasionally presents the quality of the folk song. It is an imitative adaptation of Du Bartas' Creation, partly in hexameters, partly in accentual alexandrines suggested by the teaching of Opitz (the Prosodia Germanica, 1624). As introducing the culture of the Renaissance and refining poetry, Arrebo is in a way the Stjernhjelm of Denmark. His influence may be traced in the poetics of Ravn (Rhythmologia Danica) and in Terkelsen's lyrical translations of portions of D'Urfé's Astrée (The Song-Book of Astraea, 1648). The most facile and important poet of the second half of the century was, however, Thomas Kingo (1634–1703), a writer of sacred verse, whose Hymns of 1681 and two Psalters of later years possess emotional fervor and fire, poetic imagination and lyrical charm. Another hymnodist, Petter Dass (1647–1708), was, also, the first significant writer of secular songs: his Nordlands Trompet is still popular among the common classes. With the religious and moral verses of his contemporary 'The Eleventh Muse,' Dorthe Engelbrechtsdatter, the survey of the formative period in Danish literature may close.

The first half of the eighteenth century is signalized not so much by definite lyrical productivity as by the development of a distinctively national literature, — a literature not of learned or provincial quality, but cultivated and European; and of this the creator was Ludvig Holberg (1684–1754), the most eminent of Scandinavian authors, well-nigh of European, in that period. The influence of Molière and Boileau and of the English Augustan school under which his mock-heroics and comedies were produced does not confine itself to his writings alone. Holberg's inspiration tells upon the lyric poetry of the succeeding generation. Only three poets of lyrical endowment occupy the period: H. A. Brorson, the continuator of Kingo's psalmody; Thöger Reenberg, whose drinking songs are of a delightful spontaneity; and a decidedly poetic writer of sacred verse and of witty and joyous lyrics, Ambrosius Stub, who died in 1758, but whose poems were practically unknown for thirteen years later. — The second half of the century is marked in drama by a revolt led by J. H. Wessel against the rhetorical French fashions that had usurped the stage soon after the death of Holberg; and by the influence in poetry of other kinds of the Swiss school of Bodmer, through Klopstock, who, coming to Copenhagen in 1751, became the idol of the rising literary generation, and (after the foundation of his Society of the Fine Arts and the Sciences in 1759) the promoter of prize poetry. The first prize poet evoked by the Klopstockian competition was a Norwegian, C. B. Tullin. He had already, in 1758, introduced the descriptive nature-poetry of Thomson's style in an idyllic epithalamium, May-Day. The next year he was awarded the Society's prize for a poem on sea-faring. The influence of Klopstock was even more decided upon the early poetry of one who was soon to be regarded as the most distinguished northern lyric writer of the century, Johannes Ewald (1743–1781). His elegy upon the death of Frederick V (a prize poem, 1766) was the finest creation of the kind that Denmark had so far produced, and even it is surpassed by his later songs and by his exquisite lyrical dramas. Especially noteworthy are his dramatized description The Fishers and the lyrical portions of his tragedy Balder's Death. Attention should be directed to his love of Scandinavian antiquity, his clarity of diction and mastery of form, and his introduction of the iambic pentameter. Next to Ewald the most important poet of this period was J. H. Wessel (1742–85), the centre of a Norwegian group of writers, mainly lyrical, who with him were in opposition not only to the affected French and Italian taste that governed the theatre but to the turgidities of German style that characterized the lesser poets of the Klopstock-Ewald school. Wessel himself produced lyrics of rich content, but is best known for a burlesque tragedy, Kjärlighed uden Strömper (Love without Stockings), which exploded the bombastic drama and Italian opera of the day. His associates in the Norwegian Society (1772), the brothers Frimann, etc., and other countrymen, not of the Society — such as E. Storm — devoted themselves to a poetry the purpose of which was to express the distinctive spirit of Norway: songs of patriotism, and lyrics descriptive of the scenery and peasant life of their fatherland. This was a genuine contribution to national literature and, because of its spontaneity, return to the folk, and reflection of the new literature of revolt then generating in France, was something of a preparation for the poetry of romanticism. — Among Danes, meanwhile, a writer welcomed by Wessel, had arisen: the 'Poet of the Graces,' Jens Baggesen (1764–1826). Baggesen was, on the one hand, an admirer of the Kantian philosophy, a personal acquaintance of Wieland and Herder (the heralds of the German romantic movement), and a transmitter by his prose writings of the new ideas to his countrymen; he was, on the other hand, the most polished and spontaneous writer of comic tales in verse that Denmark had known. He was not only the inheritor and refiner of Wessel's style in this respect, but a most distinguished master in the composition of the descriptive poem, the humorous lyric, and *vers de société*. Though never in sympathy with the extravagant tendencies of the new Danish poetry, nay, directly antagonistic in his later years to the standard-bearers of romanticism, he was by training one of the precursors of the modern movement.

Of the romanticism of the nineteenth century, the philosopher Steffens was the father. His lectures in 1802 upon Schelling's philosophy of nature and of history, and upon the romantic poetry of Goethe and Schiller, were the inspiration of Adam Gottlob Oehlenschläger, the greatest of the romantic poets of Denmark. Oehlenschläger (1779–1850) drew the materials of his most famous tragedies, verse-romances, idyllic and epic poems, from mythological and historical sources of the Scandinavian past. In these will be noted the folk spirit, the lyrical current, sublime, romantic, tender, the colored fancy and depth of feeling, that characterize, also, his poems of specifically lyrical form. Likewise influenced by the new romanticism and idealistic philosophy of Germany was his senior contemporary, Schack von Staffeldt, whose lyrics are distinguished by a fresh and melodious refinement of form and a depth of reflective content. Another contemporary, influenced by the teachings of Steffens, but more independent of the romantic school in poetry, was the scholar, religious teacher, and man of action, Grundtvig (1783–1872). A fruitful writer of lyrics, historical, national, and sacred, he is even more than Oehlenschläger Scandinavian in tone, — the prophet of a unified national consciousness centering in simplicity of Christian life. In the critical attack made by Baggesen upon the less inspired extravagances of Oehlenschläger's romanticism, Grundtvig stood by the former. — Among the more eminent of the immediate followers of Oehlenschläger was Ingemann (1789–1862) — of mystical tendency and best known for his romantic novels but, as a lyrist of nature and of religious themes, also of decided excellence. Another of this younger romantic generation and, like Ingemann, mystical by predilection was the serious and zealous idealist Hauch, a Norwegian writer of exquisite lyrics and lyrical dramas and romances, as well as of historical novel and tragedy. A few years younger than Hauch and Ingemann were three other lyrists: Bödtcher, a poet of joy and love, and of Italian atmosphere and skies; the humorous and cheery Möller; and, more distinguished than either, a national poet of love, the beauty of nature, and the charm of pastoral life, Christian Winther (1796–1876). Most of these men were attached to the interest of Oehlenschläger during his literary feud with Baggesen and Grundtvig. Of the more conservative school supporting the two latter, the most eminent writers were Heiberg and Hertz. J. L. Heiberg (1791–1860) was a critic and aesthetician, an able lyrist as well as an effective dramatist and satirist, the exponent in Denmark of Hegel's philosophy, and the literary dictator of his day. His friend, Hertz, the comic dramatist, was also a lyrist of opulent fancy and highly polished diction and versification. — The most poetic genius of the mid-century was F. Paludan-Müller (1809–1876), whose religious idealism and classical grace will be noted in epic, satirical and lyrical, in tragedy, and in lyric pure and simple. With him may be mentioned also C. C. Bagger and the erotic and ironic poet, E. Aarestrup. Slightly younger were the practical and patriotic song-writer, Carl Ploug; the musical writer of lyrics, and composer of comedies and operas, J. C. Hostrup; and H. V. Kaalund. — Of the poets of the younger generation the most original and deeply emotional in the lyrical field would appear to be Christian Richardt (b. 1831); but as representing the new tendency toward realism the poet, especially lyric poet, Holger Drachmann is preëminent, — and the critic and literary historian, Georg Brandes.

B. *The Poetry of New Norway*, after the separation from Denmark in 1814, began with the patriotic verse of a few minor writers who made the transition from the poetry of the Norwegian Society (mentioned under Wessel above) to that of a politically independent and original Norwegian consciousness. Such consciousness first expressed itself (1829) in the extravagant odes and other lyrics of Henrik Wergeland (1808–1845), and in his rationalistic lyrical epic — The Creation, Man, and Messiah — of 1830. The wild and uninformed idealism of his exclusively Norwegian point of view and the inartistic quality of his verse were attacked in 1832 by a thoroughly trained scholar and poet, J. S. C. Welhaven (1807–1873). About him gathered in the controversy that ensued a body of writers, the Intelligents, believers in historical and cosmopolitan prerequisites for any serious development of Norwegian literature. In 1834 Welhaven published his Dawn of Norway, a series of exquisite and satirical sonnets which had incalculable influence in shaping the course of the national literature toward sane and artistic performance. The later lyrics of his opponent, Wergeland, were an improvement upon the earlier; the lyrics of Welhaven are the most graceful that Norway has produced. Other poets of this generation, worthy of consideration, were Munch, Vinje (the leader of the movement for a distinctively Norwegian tongue), and preëminently Bishop Jörgen Moe — who not only wrote excellent lyrics but cultivated the taste for original Norwegian literature by collecting folk-material. — In the period which closed with the end of the century, the literature of Norway at last became truly European in significance; but its two great writers, Ibsen and Björnstjerne Björnson, are better known in the field of drama and of novel than by their lyrics, admirable though some of them are.

Texts and References. *For Vedel*, his 100 udvalgte danske Viser (Ribe: 1591) and C. F. Wegener's Biographie (in the transl. of Saxo Grammaticus, Copenh.: 1851). *On Arrebo*, H. F. Rördam's Arrebo's Levnet og Skrifter (Copenh.: 1857). *On Kingo*, A. C. L. Heiberg's Thomas Kingo (Odense: 1852). *On Holberg*, R. Prutz's Ludwig Holberg, sein Leben und seine Schriften (Stuttg. and Augsb.: 1857), and on the comedies, A. Legrelle's Holberg considéré comme imitateur de Molière (Paris: 1864). *On Tullin*, the article in H. Jaeger's Literaturhistoriske Pennetegninger (Copenh.: 1878). *On Ewald*, the Levnet by Hammerich (Copenh.: 1861). *On Wessel*, the biography in

J. Levin's edition of the Digte (2d ed., Copenh.: 1878), and Welhaven's Ewald og de norske Digtere (in Welhaven's Samlede Skrifter, VIII, Copenh.: 1868). *On Baggesen*, the biography by A. Baggesen (4 vols., Copenh.: 1843–56) and Kr. Arentzen's Baggesen og Oehlenschläger (8 vols., Copenh.: 1870–78). *On Oehlenschläger*, the preceding, and Arentzen's Adam Oehlenschläger (Copenh.: 1879); also C. L. N. Mynster's Mindeblade om Oehlenschläger og hans Kreds (Copenh.: 1879). *On Staffeldt*, F. L. Liebenberg's Samlinger til Staffeldt's Levnet (4 vols., Copenh.: 1846–51). *On Grundtvig*, Julius Kaftan's Grundtvig, der Profet des Nordens (Basel: 1877). *For Heiberg*, his Poetiske Skrifter, and his Prosaiske Skrifter (11 vols. each, Copenh.: 1861–62). *For Paludan-Müller* his Poetiske Skrifter (8 vols., Copenh.: 1878–79). *On Wergeland*, H. Lassen's study of Wergeland og hans Samtid (Christiania: 1866) and H. Schwanenflügel's Henrik Wergeland (Copenh.: 1877). *For Welhaven*, his Samlede Skrifter (8 vols., Copenh.: 1867–68).

XIX. **Lyric Poetry of the Lapps and Finns.**

On the lyric poetry of the Lapps see O. Donner's Lieder der Lappen (Helsingfors: 1876, p. 21–29 Die Lyrik). Donner's authorities are Scheffer's Lapponia (Frankfurt: 1673); J. A. Friis' Lappisk Mythologi, eventyr og folkesagn (Christiania: 1871); von Düben's Lappland; Jakob Fellman's Swedish transl. of five songs in the Fosterländskt Album, III (Helsingfors: 1847).

A fine German collection and translation of Finnish Songs is given by Hermann Paul: Kanteletar, die Volkslyrik d. Finnen (Helsingfors: 1882). See the remarks An den Leser. C. J. Billson's Popular Poetry of the Finns (Lond.: 1900) should also be used; it contains a list of English, French, and German works on Finnish poetry. Comparetti's important Traditional Poetry of the Finns is noted elsewhere (see Index). For histories of Finnish literature see Gosse's article in the Encyc. Brit., 11th ed. See also the notes on versification given by Gayley and Scott, pp. 514–515.

XX. **The Russian Lyric.**

In general, the student should consult Leo Wiener's Anthology of Russian Literature (2 vols. N.Y.: 1902), where bibliographical and historical material, as well as translations, will be found. See also de Gubernatis as cited above, § 5. The first collection of Russian popular songs was made by Richard James in 1619. Bowring's Anthology of Russian Poetry (2 vols. 1821–23) suffers from an incomplete knowledge of the Russian language. The history of the lyric may be traced in the appropriate chapters of K. Waliszewski's Russian Literature (Literatures of the World Series, Lond. and N.Y.). On more recent Russian lyric poetry see W. R. Morfill's article on Russian Literature in the Encyc. Brit.; Miss I. F. Hapgood's A Survey of Russian Literature (N.Y.: 1902); and other works mentioned by Wiener, vol. I, pp. vii–xi. Especially noteworthy are the lyrics of Bogdanovich (Dushenka), Derzhávin (Ode to God), Zhukóvskiy (Translations, The Poet in the Camp of the Russian Warriors), Pushkin (of prime importance). Lérmontov, Koltzov, Nekrasov, Maikov, and Palonski are the best of recent lyrists. See A. Brückner's work, cited in the Appendix, as follows: pp. 84 ff. Lomonosov and his times, the ode; 126–132 Derzhávin, and others, and more odes; 126–127 Derzhávin's recipe for the ode; 178 ff. Pushkin; Chap. VII romantic poets; thence *passim*, and, especially, Chap. XVIII. Specimen verses may be found in C. T. Wilson's Russian Lyrics in English Verse (Lond.: 1887) and J. Pollen's Rhymes from the Russian (Lond.: 1891). — For versification, see Gayley and Scott, p. 513.

XXI. **Serbian, Cheskian, Magyar, and Polish Lyrics.**

For Anthologies of Serbian, Cheskian, Magyar, and Polish lyrics, easy reference may be made to Dr. Bowring's series of translations. They do not include poems of later date than 1832. His Serbian lyrics (Servian Popular Poetry. London: 1827) are translated principally from the famous collection by Vuk Stefánovich Karájich, Servian National Songs (10 vols., Leipz.: 1823–24; new Government ed., 1891); he has also made use of E. Wessely's Serbische Hochzeitslieder (Pesth: 1826). The most scholarly and poetic modern collection in English is, however, that by G. R. Noyes and Leonard Bacon, Heroic Ballads of Servia (Boston: 1913). It includes thirty-seven ballads translated (with one exception from the Serbian of Karájich's edition) by Noyes and put into vigorous metres by Bacon. The Introduction gives an admirable and concise account of the type. Among the authorities to which reference is made are Professor Pópovich, Sketch of Servian Literature (in Serbian; Belgrade: 1909); E. L. Mijatovich, Kossovo (Lond.: 1881); D'Avril, La Bataille de Kossovo (Paris: 1868); Vogl, Marko Kraljevits (Vienna: 1851), — and others on Serbian history and customs. For other references to Serbian ballads and lyrics, see Encyc. Brit., Art. on Servia, and the literary histories given in the Appendix. — *On Cheskian* (*Bohemian*) *lyrics* the principal authorities (cited by Bowring) are Hanke's collection in four volumes (the Starobylá

Skládánie, and his edition of the false Kralodworsky, MSS.); collections made by Wenzel Thám (Prague: 1785), by Chelakowsky, and by Ritter von Rittersberg (Prague: 1825). A critical review of Bohemian Popular Poetry by M. Müller appeared in the *Prague Monthly Periodical*, August, 1827. See also the histories of literature cited in the Appendix. — The most comprehensive Anthology of *Hungarian* (*Magyar*) *literature* is probably Fr. J. Schedel's Handbuch der ungarischen Poesie (2 vols. Pesth and Vienna: 1828). Bowring's Poetry of the Magyars was issued in 1830. Another valuable collection is Count Mailath's Magyarische Gedichte (Stuttg. und Tübingen: 1825). Reference should also be made to the article in the Encyc. Brit. by E. D. Butler and to J. H. Schwicker, Gesch. der ungarischen Lit. (1889); also to C. Horváth, etc., Histoire de la littérature hongroise (Paris: 1900), and to F. Riedl, History of Hungarian Literature (Literatures of the World Series; Lond. and N.Y.). Specially beautiful are the lyrics of Alexander Petöf, Tompa, and Arany. For references on the influence of the Hungarian lyric, see Betz-Baldensperger, La litt. comparée, Essai bibliog., Chap. XI (2d ed. Strasbourg: 1904). — On the *Polish lyric* W. R. Morfill's article in the Encyc. Brit. (Poland) is very instructive. See also A. Brückner's Gesch. der polnischen Litt. (Leipz.: 1901); the History of Polish Literature by Anton Malecki (in Polish); Braun's De Scriptorum Poloniae Virtutibus et Vitiis; Kaluski's Bibliotheca Poetarum Polonorum; Duclos' Essai sur l'histoire littéraire de Pologne; Münnich's Gesch. d. polnischen Lit.; and other works referred to by Morfill and Bowring. Adalb. Cybalski's Geschichte der polnischen Dichtkunst in der 1ten Hälfte des laüfigen Jahrh. (Posen: 1880) is one of the best of recent studies of the subject. Paul Soboleski's Poets and Poetry of Poland (Chicago: 1881) is a much fuller collection (selections from sixty poets; also biographical and historical notes) than Bowring's, but the translations are of uneven merit. For references on Mickiewicz, see below, § 12, XVI. See also G. M. C. Brandes, Poland, A Study of Land, People, and Literature (Lond.: 1903).

Brief outlines of the history of Cheskian, Magyar, and Polish lyric literature, and specimen translations into Italian, will be found in de Gubernatis as cited above, § 5.

XXII. The Turkish Lyric.

For the lyric literature of the Orient in general the student is referred to the bibliography of oriental philology listed in the Appendix. — On Turkish poetry, see von Hammer-Purgstall, Die Geschichte der osmanischen Dichtkunst, which includes translations from the original; E. J. W.

Gibb, A History of Ottoman Poetry (6 vols. Lond.: 1900–1909), and a very brief outline of Turkish literature in the Encyc. Brit., 11th ed.; by the same, Ottoman Poems, containing an introduction and translations (Lond.: 1882), and Ottoman Literature, translations with notes (Lond.: 1901); J. Redhouse, On the History, System, and Varieties of Turkish Poetry (1879); de Gubernatis as cited above, § 5; P. Horn in Hinneberg's Kult. d. Gegenwart, T. I Abt. VII (1906). Translations of Turkish folk songs have been published by Ignaz Kunos in the *Wiener Zeitschr. f. d. Kunde d. Morgenl.* (vols. II, III, IV), and by Maximilian Bittner in vol. XI of the same series.

XXIII. The Afghan Lyric.

Students employing the comparative method of study will be interested in J. Darmesteter's account of the popular poetry of the Afghans (Chants populaires des Afghans. 1888–90). For further materials see the works of Capt. H. G. Raverty, including his Selections from the Poetry of the Afghans (Lond.: 1862).

XXIV. The Syriac and Armenian Lyric.

For the Syrian lyric, see Nöldeke and Finck in Hinneberg's Kult. d. Gegenwart, T. I Abt. VII (1906), Baumgartner, vol. I, p. 179 ff., and W. Wright's Short History of Syriac Literature (Lond.: 1894), which is a reprint, with additions, of the author's article on Syriac literature in the Encyc. Brit., 9th ed. Some Syrian songs will be found in an English translation by H. M. Huxley (*Journal of the American Oriental Society*, 23: 175 ff.). A pamphlet of Armenian Popular Songs (Venice: 1888) contains nineteen folk songs collected from Armenian manuscripts in the library of St. Lazarus. English translations, exceedingly crude but intelligible, accompany the originals.

XXV. The Lyric of Arabia.

Students using this book will in all probability be concerned with the lyric phase only of Arabic literature, and for this reason the various histories of the literature of the Arabians are placed here rather than in the Appendix. The best materials will be found by referring to the following works: Clément Huart, History of Arabic Literature (Literatures of the World Series, Lond. and N.Y.); Nicholson, Literary History of the Arabs (N.Y.: 1907); Hammer-Purgstall, Literatur-Geschichte der Araber (7 vols. Wien: 1850–56); W. Ahlwardt, Über Poesie und Poetik der Araber (Gotha: 1856); T. Nöldeke, Beiträge zur Kenntniss der Poesie der alten Araber

(Hannover: 1864); J. G. Wenig, Zur allgemeinen Charakteristik der arabischen Poesie (Innsbruck: 1870); A. von Kremer, Culturgeschichte des Orients (2 vols. Wien: 1877; vol. II, pp. 341–395 Poesie); Arbuthnot, Arabic Authors — A Manual of Arabian History and Literature (Lond.: 1890); C. Brockelmann, Geschichte der arabischen Litteratur (Weimar: 1898); and a work of the same title, and by the same author, in Die Litteraturen des Ostens (Leipz.: 1901); Hartmann, Das arabische Strophengedicht (Weimar: 1897). For a brief view, see M. Junde Goeje in Hinneberg's Kult. d. Gegenwart, T. I Abt. VII (1906). For translations of Arabian lyric poetry, see notes in Baumgartner, vol. I, p. 301 ff.; Brockelmann; Huart; etc. Fr. Rückert published several volumes of translations into German. Short translations and accounts of Arabic literature have appeared in the Wisdom of the East series (John Murray, Lond.), such as Al Ghazzali's Alchemy of Happiness and Confessions, Ibn Tufail's Awakening of the Soul, the Diwan of Abu'l-ala, and "some echoes of Arabian poetry" in The Singing Caravan, by H. Baerlein. On poetry of the people see Schaefer, Songs of an Egyptian Peasant, English ed. by J. H. Breasted (Leipz.: 1904); Littmann, Neuarabische Volkspoesie (Berlin: 1902).

XXVI. **The Persian Lyric.**

For general histories of Persian literature, see the Appendix. Specific references to the lyric will be found in the following: E. G. Browne, Lit. Hist. of Persia (vol. I, pp. 95–102 The Avesta; see also, and especially, Chap. XIII, on Ṣūfī Mysticism and its relation to the poets, — bibliog. note, p. 444; to which add references in the Grundriss, vol. II, p. 273); the second volume of Browne's work (N.Y.: 1906) carries the history from the 11th to the 13th century (Firdawsī to Saʽdi); J. Darmesteter, Les origines de la poésie persane (Paris: 1887); R. W. Emerson, Persian Poetry (Works, Centenary ed., vol. VIII, pp. 237–265); K. Geldner and Paul Horn in Hinneberg's Kult. d. Gegenwart, T. I Abt. VII (1906); H. Ethé, Neupersische Litteratur (in Geiger and Kuhn's Grundriss d. iran. Philol., Strassburg: 1895–1904, vol. II, p. 212 ff.), — the best account of the subject, with bibliographical notes that should be consulted: the student of Persian literature must make this Grundriss his point of departure. The article on Persian Lit. in the Encyc. Brit. is also by Ethé. J. H. Moulton's Early Religious Poetry of Persia (Cambridge Manuals of Sc. and Lit. 1911) affords a brief introduction to the older literature, — perhaps the best survey for the beginner.

Because of its distinct and strongly marked characteristics, its wide difference from the native European lyric, and its influence upon an exotic development in the history of European poetry, the lyric literature of Persia offers profitable fields of investigation to the student who is equipped for the undertaking. For the comparative study of the nature and progress of the lyric, such investigation is essential.

The Persian lyric, like that of all ancient nations, and most of the modern, is in general of two sorts: (*a*) the early, impersonal, and, by comparison, objective, religious-heroic lyric, belonging to the remote development of the people, and found in their oldest religious texts, — in this case, in the Avesta; and (*b*) the later, subjective, personal lyric, — in this case the lyric, say, of Omar (ʿUmar), *c.* 1100, Saʿdi and Jalalu'd-Din Rumi, of the thirteenth century, Hafiz (Hafiḍh) of the fourteenth, Jami of the fifteenth, if these poets may be taken as representative of the love poetry and philosophical poetry, both mystical, into which the secular lyric divides. Of course the Persian lyric has developed other minor kinds, especially the lyric of wit. The Persian classification of poetic kinds is given by H. Ethé as follows: *qaṣīda*, or hymn (Loblied), with the *hajw*, or satire, and the *marthiya*, or elegy; the *qiṭʿa*, or fragment, differentiated from the first by a prosodical change; the *ghazal*, or ode, subdivided into religious hymn, love-song, and wine-song; the *mathnawī* (epic or didactic-mystical poetry), divided into historic epic, romantic epic, and learned and descriptive poetry (the last of which may be purely ethical, purely mystical, or both), and the *rubāʿī* (pl., rubáiyát; lit., quatrains) or philosophical wit-poem (see Grundriss der iran. Philol., vol. II, p. 219). E. G. Browne gives a more complete and satisfactory classification (*op. cit.*, vol. II, p. 22 ff.).

The Avesta (for the conflicting views of its origin and age, see E. G. Browne, Lit. Hist. of Persia, pp. 95–96) as it exists to-day is only a fragment. It is made up of: (1) the *Yasna*, "consisting of hymns recited in honour of the different angels, spirits, and divine beings," and including the ancient *Gāthās* (or ' songs,' — see Grundriss d. iran. Philol., vol. II, p. 29, § 25), which, according to some authorities, Zoroaster himself composed; (2) the *Vispered*, containing supplementary liturgical material; (3) the *Vendidād*, containing religious laws and mythology; (4) the *Yashts*, made up of hymns celebrating angels, etc.; (5) the *Korda Avesta* (' Little Avesta '), consisting principally of a collection of prayers. The student of the lyric will find most of his material in the first and fourth parts, and will be particularly interested in the Gāthās. A valuable comparative study might be made of the lyric parts of the Avesta, the Vedas, and other similar religious or ' inspired ' lyrics of the ancient nations, including the Babylonians, the Egyptians, the Hebrews, etc. The nature of the study might well consist of (*a*) an analysis to determine similarities and variations of form, content, and purpose; (*b*) an attempt to explain such similarities and variations by antecedent and environmental social and other conditions; (*c*) generalizations on the probable law of development involved in the variations, and on the probable relation of such religious lyrics to the secular heroic lyric (such as Pindar's), and to the secular personal lyric (such as those of Sappho or Hafiz). Could such laws be determined, doubtless they would throw much light upon the laws of culture-development, — light that would illumine in turn the antecedents of some of our present cultural conditions.

The Persian secular lyric is of great importance, not only because of its influence upon the European lyric (see Goethe's West-östliche Divan, Bodenstedt's Mirza Schaffy, and the flock of occidental imitations, for which cf. above, division XIII, F of this section, A. V. W. Jackson, Our Interest in Persia, etc. — St. Louis Congress of Arts and Sciences, III, 358. Boston: 1906, — and P. Horn, Was verdanken wir Persien? — in *Nord und Süd*, Sept. 1900, p. 384 ff., — also Fitzgerald's Omar, with its flock of imitations), but also because of the peculiar extension of the nature of the lyric involved in the idiosyncrasies of the Persian varieties. Monotony of form and conventionality of setting and diction exist side by side with extraordinary richness and unusual ardor of imagination: the erotic and the convivial are inextricably intertwined with the mystical and sceptical, — often with a mystical pessimism. Instructive comparisons might be instituted between the conventionality of the *ghazal* (ode) and that of the sonnet. Psychological studies might be made of the influence of such forms on the lyric state of mind, or 'inspiration.' An interesting problem for investigation is the influence exercised upon the content of the lyric — even on its monotony of form — by the social position of Persian women and by the teachings of the Koran about the connubial blisses of Paradise. The peculiar attitude of the Koran toward wine-drinking when considered in contrast with the lyrical praise of the grape presents another problem. Many such considerations, social, political, religious, economic, await comparative investigation; nor is it too much to suppose that profound but subtle influences behind the lyric may be traced in part, at least, to conditions of natural, physical environment. The lyric of Asia and the lyric of Europe are not more characteristically alike or different in their general tendencies than are the physical conditions of the two continents. But, at any rate, the striking peculiarities of the Persian lyric and of Persian society present to the European or American student's observation that fortunate contrast with the habitual that very often opens the eye of discovery.

Translations. Translations of the Avesta: (*a*) English: by Mills and Darmesteter (in Sacred Books of the East. Ed. by Max Müller, vols. IV, XXIII, XXXI. Oxford: 1877, 1880, 1883); by A. Bleek, an English translation from the German of Spiegel (Hertford: 1864); by L. H. Mills, The Five Zoroastrian Gâthâs (Leipz.: 1894), and The Gâthâs of Zarathushtra (2d ed. Oxford: 1900); by M. N. Dhalla, The Nyaishes or Zoroastrian Litanies (N.Y., Columbia University: 1908); by L. C. Casartelli, Leaves from my Eastern Garden (mostly from the Avesta; Market Weighton: 1908). (*b*) French: the first translation of the Avesta was made by Anquetil du Perron (3 vols. Paris: 1771). The standard French translation is that by J. Darmesteter, Le Zend-Avesta, etc., with historical and philological commentary (3 vols. Paris: 1892–93, being vols. XXI, XXII, and XXIV of the *Annales du*

Musée Guimet). See also the translation of C. de Harlez, Avesta, etc. (3 vols. Liège: 1875–77; 2d ed. Paris: 1881; in the Bibliothèque Orientale, vol. V). (*c*) German: F. Spiegel, Avesta, etc. (3 vols. Leipz.: 1852–63); earlier translations and adaptations by F. J. Klenker (Riga: 1776, etc.; see Grundriss d. iran. Philol., II, 1). C. Bartholomae's Die Gatha des Avesta (Strassburg: 1905) is the most trustworthy.

English translations of the more important lyric poets are listed under the names of the poets in Ethé's article in the second volume of the Grundriss (see above). Notices of translations into modern languages will be found in Moulton and in Baumgartner, vol. I, p. 453 ff. Of late it has become something of a fad to publish small books of translations from the Persian, but the student must beware of accepting all of these as faithfully representing the Persian originals. For several volumes of value see the Wisdom of the East Series (John Murray, Lond.). The student of the popular lyric will consult A. Chodzko's Specimens of the Popular Poetry of Persia, etc. (in *Publications of the Oriental Translation Fund of Great Britain and Ireland*, Lond.: 1842).

References. See the following works by Ethé: Art., Modern Persian Lit. (Encyc. Brit., 9th ed.), Die höfische und romantische Poesie der Perser (in *Samml. gemeinverst. wiss. Vorträge*. Ed. by Virchow and Holtzendorff, N. F. II, 7. Hamburg: 1887), Die mystische, didaktische und lyrische Poesie . . . der Perser (*ibid.* III, 53. Hamburg: 1888), Rûdagî der Sâmâniden-Dichter (in *Göttinger Nachrichten*, 1873, pp. 663–742), Rûdagî's Vorläufer, etc. (in *Morgenländische Forschungen*, 1875, pp. 33–68), Art., Rûdagî (Encyc. Brit., 9th ed.), Firdûsî als Lyriker (in *Münchener Sitzungsberichte*, 1872, pp. 275–304, and 1873, pp. 623–653), etc. etc. The Farhang-i Shuʽarā, or 'Dictionary of the Poets,' has been translated by Hammer-Purgstall in his Duftkörner aus persischen Dichtern (2d ed. Stuttgart: 1860). Consult also K. F. Geldner, Art., Zend-Avesta (Encyc. Brit.), and the admirable Art., Avestalitteratur (in vol. II of the Grundriss der iran. Philol., where the student will find further bibliography); C. de Harlez, Introduction to his translation of the Avesta, noted above; M. Haug, Essays on the Sacred Language, Writings, and Religion of the Parsis (2d ed. Ed. by E. W. West. Lond.: 1878; 3d ed. 1884); P. Horn (as cited in Appendix), p. 1 ff. Avesta, 114 ff. Lyric, including Hafiz, 145 ff. Religious and mystic lyric, including Omar; A. Hovelacque, L'Avesta, Zoroastre et le Mazdéisme (Paris: 1880); H. Hübschmann, Ein zoroastrisches Lied mit Rücksicht auf die Tradition übersetzt und erklärt (München: 1872); A. V. W. Jackson, Persia Past and Present (an admirable introduction to the study of Persian life and literature in general); by the same, A Hymn of Zoroaster (*Yasna*, XXXI), and Zoroaster (N.Y.: 1899; most important for a knowledge of historical facts); by the same, Die iranische Religion (in the Grundriss, vol. II; indispensable to the understanding of the thought underlying the Avesta); by the same, the article on Zoroastrianism in Hastings' *Bible Dictionary*, vol. IV; Sir G. Ouseley, Biographical Notices of Persian Poets, etc. (Lond.: 1846); C. J. Pickering's articles (A Persian Chaucer, in *Nat. Rev.*, May: 1890; The Beginnings of Persian Literature, *ibid.*, July: 1890; Firdausi's Lyrical Poetry, *ibid.*, Feb.: 1890) — merely a working over of material drawn from German (H. Ethé) and French publications; I. Pizzi, Storia della poesia persiana (2 vols. Torino: 1894); E. A. Reed, Persian Literature, Ancient and Modern, p. 130 ff. Gáthás, — other lyric poetry *passim* (Chicago: 1893). — On the Prosody of the Persians, see H. Blochmann, The Prosody of the Persians (Calcutta: 1872); F. Gladwin, Dissertations on the Rhetoric, Prosody, and Rhyme of the Persians (Lond.: 1801); C. Huart, a French translation of Sharafu'd-Din Rámí's *Anísu'l'-Ushsháq* ('Lover's Companion') (Paris: 1875), — "a valuable guide to Persian lyric verse"; cf. Rückert's Grammatik, Poetik und Rhetorik der Perser (2d ed. Gotha: 1874).

XXVII. The Indian Lyric.

E. W. Hopkins (The Early Lyric Poetry of India, in his India Old and New, N.Y.: 1901; cf. A. Weber, Hist. of Indian Lit., 1878, pp. 208–210) notices four stages of lyric development in India: (1) about 800 B.C., — religious and heroic stage, to which belong the Vedas; (2) about 400 B.C., — devotional and sentimental, or epic-lyric stage; (3) the stage of the simple love-lyric; (4) the complex love-lyric of the later poets, — a mystical fusion of erotic and religious elements.

For the lyrism of the Vedic hymns — hymns to the gods and in praise of the heroic past — see the two works mentioned above, the general histories of Indian literature listed in the Appendix, Bühler and Kielhorn's Encyclopaedia of Indo-Aryan Research, and the following: H. Blodget, Vedic Hymns (*Journ. of the Amer. Oriental Soc.*, vol. XIII, Proc., pp. 112 ff., 132 ff.); M. Bloomfield, The Atharva-veda (in Bühler-Kielhorn, II, 1, B, 1899); H. Brunnhofer, Über den Geist der indischen Lyrik (Leipz.: 1882); É. Bournouf, Essai sur la Véda, etc. (Paris: 1863); H. T. Colebrook, the first to present a survey of the Vedas, in his essay On the Vedas (*Asiat. Res.*, vol. VIII, pp. 369–476. Calcutta: 1805; also in Colebrook's Miscellaneous Essays, ed.

by Cowell, 1873; vol. I, pp. 8–132), — valuable now only as a seminal publication; the third part of Henry's work, cited in the Appendix, — very sketchy; A. Kaegi, Der Rigveda (2d ed. Leipz.: 1880; English translation by R. Arrowsmith, Boston: 1898), — valuable as an historical and bibliographical guide, but already out of date; Macdonell's History of Sanskrit Literature, cited in the Appendix (the best introduction for the English student — see p. 438 ff. of the work for bibliography); A. A. Macdonell's Early Religious Poetry of India (Camb. Manuals of Sci. and Lit.) has been announced; Max Müller, Chips from a German Workshop (2d ed. Lond.: 1868, vol. I Lecture on the Vedas); H. Oldenberg, Die Hymnen des Rigveda, Bd. I Metrische Prolegomena (Berlin: 1888); by the same, Die Religion des Veda (Berlin: 1894), with which compare Professor Lanman's studies in the chronological strata of the hymns of the Rig-Veda, and Bergaigne's La Religion védique (3 vols. Paris: 1878–83); R. Roth — the founder of Vedic philology — various works: especially On the Literature and History of the Veda (translation into English by J. Muir. Calcutta: 1880), the German original of which, Zur Litteratur und Geschichte des Weda (Stuttgart: 1846), was one of the earliest incentives to the study of the Vedas; W. D. Whitney, several papers on the Veda in his Oriental and Linguistic Studies (vol. I. N.Y.: 1873).

Translations of the Vedas: For the Rig-Veda and other Vedic literature, see the Sacred Books of the East, ed. by Max Müller (Rig-veda, vols. XXXII, XLVI, trans. by Müller and Oldenberg; Atharva-veda, vol. XLII, trans. by M. Bloomfield); also Müller's Rig-Veda-Sanhita: The Sacred Hymns of the Brahmans (Lond.: 1869); R. T. H. Griffith, The Rigveda Metrically Translated into English (2 vols. Benares: 1896–97). There are German translations by H. Grassmann, Rig-Veda (2 vols. Leipz.: 1876–77), and by A. Ludwig, into German prose (6 vols. Prag: 1876–88). For further bibliography of translations, see the notes to the English translation of Kaegi's work mentioned above. Compare W. D. Whitney's essay On the Translation of the Veda (in his Oriental and Linguistic Studies. 2 vols. N.Y.: 1873–74; vol. I, pp. 100–132); and Kaegi-Arrowsmith, *op. cit.*, pp. 9–10.

For later lyric poetry (A.D. 400–1100), see the general histories, especially Chap. XII of Macdonell. Oldenberg's Die Literatur des alten Indiens (Berlin: 1903) is important and trustworthy, — see Chap. IV, § III. W. R. Alger's The Poetry of the Orient (Boston: 1865) does not assign its translations to the original authors, and is generally untrustworthy. Kālidāsa's Meghadūta ('Cloud Messenger') has been translated into English verse by H. H. Wilson (3d ed. Lond.: 1867),

T. Clark (Lond.: 1882), A. W. Ryder (in *The University of California Chronicle*, vol. XIII, Jan. 1911; and in his Kalidasa, Everyman's Library, 1912). German translations by Max Müller (Königsberg: 1847), Schütz (Bielefeld: 1859), Fritze (Chemnitz: 1879). Other lyrics are translated by A. W. Ryder in his Women's Eyes (S. F.: 1910) and More Verses from the Sanskrit (*Univ. Calif. Chron.*, vol. XIV, No. 3). For bibliography of lyrics of the period, see Macdonell, p. 448. For the folk-lyric, see C. E. Gover, Folk-Songs of Southern India (Trübner & Co.: n. d.), and other works.

For references on Indian versification, see Gayley and Scott, pp. 515–516, and E. V. Arnold, Vedic Metre (Lond.: 1905) — very valuable in its analysis of the metrical materials of the Rig-Veda.

XXVIII. **The Sumerian and Babylonian Lyric.**

Of the works cited in the Appendix, the student will find readiest aid in Weber, pp. 114–147, and Bezold (in Hinneberg's Kultur der Gegenwart, I, VII). Translations of Babylonian hymns may be found in the histories of the literature and in *The Journal of the American Oriental Society*. The latter contains considerable material, such as J. D. Prince's translation of a Hymn to Nergal (vol. XXVIII, 1st Half, p. 168 ff.), or the same author's Hymn to Bêlit (vol. XXIV, 103 ff.), or F. A. Vanderburgh's translation of a Hymn to Bêl (vol. XXIX), etc., etc. (see Index, vol. XXI, 1st Half). See also Bezold, Babyl.-assyr. Litt. (Leipz.: 1886); Craig, Assyrian and Babylonian Relig. Texts (Leipz.: 1895); C. D. Gray, The Šamaš Relig. Texts (Chicago: 1901); M. I. Hussey, Some Sumerian-Babyl. Hymns of the Berlin Collection (in *Am. Jr. of Semitic Langs. and Lits.*, vol. XXIII. 1907); S. Langdon, Sumerian and Babyl. Psalms (Paris: 1909); by the same, Babyl. Liturgies (Paris: 1913); Martin, Textes relig. assyr. et babyl. (in *Bibl. de l'École des Hautes Études*, vol. CXXX. 1900); Pinckert, Hymnen und Gebete an Nebo (Leipz.: 1907); Reisner, Sumerisch-babyl. Hymnen (Berlin: 1896); R. W. Rogers, Cuneiform Parallels to the Old Testament (Oxford: 1912); Vanderburgh, Sumerian Hymns (N.Y.: 1908); H. Zimmern, Babyl. Busspsalmen (Leipz.: 1885); by the same, Babylonische Hymnen, etc. (in *Der Alte Orient*, VII. Leipz.: 1905); by the same, Sumerisch-babylonische Tamūz-lieder (in *König.-sächs. Gesellsch. d. Wissensch. Berichte ü. d. Verhandl. philol.-hist. Klasse*, vol. LIX, pp. 201–252. Leipz.: 1907); the vols. of the *Am. Jr. of Semitic Langs. and Lits.*, the *Zeitschr. für Assyriologie*, and Delitzsch and Haupt's Beiträge zur Assyriologie. On Babylonian metrics see H. Zimmern in *Zeitschr. f. Assyr.*, vols. VIII, X, XI, XII.

XXIX. **The Egyptian Lyric.**

The Egyptian Book of the Dead contains a collection of ritualistic lyrics and religious formulae that should be taken into account in a comparative study of the ancient religious lyric. In these lyrics it is not hard to detect late explanatory passages that were added to the original texts by priestly redactors; and this circumstance is of aid to the student of the development of such poetry from naïve beginnings, entirely lyrical, to later stages in which the accretion of explanatory and didactic materials convert it from its pure lyrism to something at once sacred and pedantic. See E. A. Wallis Budge, The Book of the Dead (Lond.: 1898), which contains a valuable introduction in addition to text and translation. For an account of the book, and for further bibliography, see Baumgartner, vol. I, p. 88 ff., and A. Erman (in Hinneberg's Kultur der Gegenwart, I, VII). The laments of Isis and Nephthys have been translated by J. T. Dennis, The Burden of Isis (Wisdom of the East Series, 1910); see also Budge's Lit. of the Ancient Egyptians (Lond.: 1914), Breasted's Ancient Records of Egypt (Chicago: 1906) and De Hymnis in Solem (Berlin: 1894), the volumes of the Records of the Past Series, and the *Zeitschr. für Aeg. Spr.*; further references in Budge, as just noted, pp. 256–258. A. Wiedemann's Popular Literature in Ancient Egypt (Lond.: 1902) and W. M. Müller's Die Liebespoesie der alten Ägypter (1899) will serve as introductions to other remnants of the Egyptian lyric. — For a note on Egyptian versification, see Gayley and Scott, p. 516.

XXX. **The Ancient Hebrew Lyric.**

Driver's Introduction to the Old Testament (10th ed. N.Y.: 1910), G. F. Moore's Literature of the Old Testament (Home University Library. N.Y.: 1913), H. Gunkel in Hinneberg's Kult. d. Gegenwart, T. I Abt. VII (1906), Kautzsch's Outline History of the Literature of the Old Testament (trans. by J. Taylor. Lond.: 1898), and H. E. Ryle's Study of the Old Testament (Internat. Theol. Library, N.Y.) are useful as introductory guides to the history of the whole subject. For the kinds of poetry and of versification the student had better begin with E. G. King's compendious statement in Early Religious Poetry of the Hebrews (Camb. Manuals of Sci. and Lit. Cambridge: 1911) and W. H. Cobb's Criticism of Systems of Hebrew Metre (Oxford: 1905). Other recent works upon the poetry in general are K. Budde's Hebrew Poetry (in Hastings' Dict. Bible), E. Kautzsch's Die Poesie und die poet. Bücher des Alten Testaments (1902), C. F. Kent's The Songs, Hymns, and Prayers of the Old Testament, E. G. King's The Psalms in Three Collections (Deighton, Bell), and E. König's Die Poesie des Alten Testaments (1911). For some of the earlier authorities, Lowth, Herder, Ewald, Saalschutz, etc., see Gayley and Scott, p. 516. — The student's readiest and most reliable aid, however, in getting at the results of modern scholarship rests in the German commentaries on the Old Testament, and of these one may especially recommend the various volumes of the Handkommentar zum Alten Testament, edited by W. Nowack. For commentaries in English, see The International Critical Commentary, edited by S. R. Driver, A. Plummer, C. A. Briggs; and The Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges, of which A. F. Kirkpatrick is the general editor for the Old Testament. If the student desires information regarding a particular lyric or book, he will consult the appropriate volume in each of these commentaries. If, for instance, he intends to work upon the book of Psalms, he will at once turn to D. F. Baethgen's edition of the Psalms in Nowack's Handkommentar, to E. G. Briggs' edition in the International Commentary, and to Kirkpatrick's edition in the Cambridge Bible. Moulton's Modern Reader's Bible provides classification and literary appreciation rather than textual or historical criticism. — Extremely valuable aid is furnished also by encyclopedias and dictionaries: for instance, the Encyclopædia Biblica, edited by T. K. Cheyne and J. S. Black, which contains a mass of information of all sorts, and is representative of the most advanced and reliable scholarship, having the exceptional virtue of everywhere distinguishing fact from theory (4 vols. Lond. and N.Y.: 1899–1903). Here will be found not only extended reviews of our present knowledge of the history and nature of the various books of the Bible, but also a host of valuable articles of historical, biographical, archaeological, economic, political, and social nature. Bibliographies are given in connection with all the more important subjects. Other scholarly encyclopedias are the Catholic, the Jewish, the Schaff-Herzog (of Religious Knowledge), and the Hastings' Dictionary of the Bible. — Finally, the aid afforded by the various histories of the Jews should be mentioned. Among the more available in English are Kent's History of the Hebrew People, and H. P. Smith's Old Testament History (N.Y.: 1903). In the works of Ewald, Graetz, and Wellhausen will be found the more famous and extensive surveys, and Geiger, Kittel, and Milman offer surveys that are also famous. But all of these need to be checked with more recent investigations. For further bibliography, see works listed in the Commentaries and in the Encyclopædia Biblica.

For versification, see Gayley and Scott, p. 516, and Encyc. Biblica, III, 3803. Cobb's Systems of Hebrew Metre, already mentioned, contains a bibliography up to 1904. More recent works on versification are J. W. Rothstein, Grundzüge d. heb. Rhythmus (Leipz.: 1909), and O. P. Zapletal, De Poesi Hebraeorum (in Latin: 1909). L. I. Newman and W. Popper's Studies in Biblical Parallelism: Amos and Isaiah, Chaps. 1–10 (*Univ. of Calif. Pubs.*, *Semitic Philol.*, vol. I, 1918), is a valuable contribution; it contains a comparative study of parallelism in Semitic and non-Semitic poetry.

For an admirable summary and classification of the poetry of the Old Testament and an indication of problems of study, see in the Encyclopædia Biblica the article Poetical Literature. The field of the Hebrew lyric may be divided as follows: (1) remnants of early popular songs, such as the Song of Lamech, the Song of Deborah, etc., imbedded in texts of a later date; (2) possible songs and elegies of David, and those due to "the establishment by David of three orders of singers and players upon musical instruments for the services of the Tabernacle" (see the first part of Lord Selborne's Art. on Hymns, in the Encyc. Brit.); (3) lyrics that originated in the period from the Divided Monarchy to the close of the Exile and are imbedded in historical and, especially, prophetic books; (4) post-exilic lyric literature, especially the Psalter and Song of Songs. Much attention should be paid to the lyric character of the prophetic books, to the First and Second Isaiah and Jeremiah in particular. The Hebrew lyric presents a wide range of variation: from the objective hymn of ritualistic occasion to the personal, subjective cry of love and despair; from the song of triumph in battle to the elegy of spiritual defeat; from the songs of alternating hope and reproach of the prophet-patriot to the highly artificial and beautifully allegoric wooing of an oriental lover. The numerous systematic studies of the texts and antiquities of the Old Testament that have accumulated during recent years provide the literary student with exceptional facilities for research into the nature of this varied lyric literature and into its laws of development.

XXXI. The Chinese Lyric.

The student will find a list of bibliographies, histories of Chinese literature, and periodicals in the Appendix. In Giles he should note the following pages: 12–21, 50–55, 97–101, 119–136, 143–188, 232–237, 247–255, 329–334. Other works are noted by Gayley and Scott, p. 517. — *Translations:* The great repositories for the English student are the Sacred Books of China, translated by J. Legge (in Sacred Books of the East. 6 vols.), and Legge's The Chinese Classics (5 vols. in 8. Oxford and Lond.: 1861–1893). Zottoli's monumental Cursus Literaturae Sinicae (5 vols. Shanghai: 1879–82) contains translations into Latin from all branches of the literature, — see vol. IV. The pieces of the Shih Ching offer suggestive material to the student of the early objective lyric. For translations, see Legge as noted above; W. Jennings, Shih-King, etc. (Lond.: 1891); C. F. R. Allen, Book of Chinese Poetry (Lond.: 1891). See also Sir J. F. Davis, Poetry of the Chinese (new ed. Lond.: 1870); H. A. Giles, Gems of Chinese Literature (Lond.: 1884); C. Budd, Chinese Poems (Lond.: 1912); H. Waddell, Lyrics from the Chinese (Boston: 1913); C. Clementi, Cantonese Love Songs (Oxford: 1905); W. Scarborough, Collection of Chinese Proverbs (Shanghai: 1875); A. Forke, Blüthen chinesischer Dichtung (Magdeburg: 1899); H. Heilmann, Chinesische Lyrik, etc. (Leipz.: 1905); H. Bethge, Die chinesische Floete (Leipz.: 1910); and several volumes in the Wisdom of the East Series (John Murray, Lond.), such as L. Cranmer-Byng's Lute of Jade and The Book of Odes.

Chinese poetry is chiefly lyrical. There is no Chinese epic; for the drama, see Encyc. Brit., VIII, 484. Of lyric verse there is an immense amount. The collection of the poetry of the T'ang Dynasty (A.D. 600–900), published in 1707, "contains 48,900 poems of all kinds, arranged in 900 books, and filling thirty good-sized volumes." This T'ang Dynasty witnessed the perfection of the Chinese lyric. Among the people lyric poetry had begun in remote antiquity. The first known collection, the Shih Ching, or 'Book of Odes,' contains 305 poems, all composed before the beginning of the sixth century B.C. The poems are arranged under four divisions: (1) ballads of popular origin; (2) odes for ordinary entertainments; (3) odes for state entertainments; (4) panegyrics and sacrificial odes. The poems have undergone an endless process of commentary and allegorical and symbolical interpretation: but in themselves they are reflections of the public and domestic life of their times. Between the death of Confucius and the second century B.C. the lyric, typified by the Li Sao of Ch'ü Yüan, becomes wild and irregular in form and content, and often unintelligible because of the mass of allegory. The Li Sao served as a model up to the time of Christ; but gradually, from the second century B.C. on, the quieter and more regular poetry of the Shih Ching became the accepted pattern for the lyric poet, and in the T'ang Dynasty the art lyric, as has already been said, attained its climax. It is typically short: Chinese poetry seems, indeed, to exemplify Poe's contention that, ideally speaking, there is no such thing as a long poem. The ideal length of the art lyric is twelve lines, "and this is the limit set to candidates at the great public examinations at the present day, the Chinese holding that if a poet cannot say within such compass what he has to say it may very well be left unsaid." The construction of the poems is highly artificial; and the greatest attention is paid to an embellished style.

All later Chinese poetry has modelled itself upon the T'ang lyric, and it may be said that little that is new in form or content has been added to the Chinese lyric since the tenth century of our era.

XXXII. **The Japanese Lyric.**

Critical material on the Japanese lyric will have to be culled from the references given in the Appendix. B. H. Chamberlain's Japanese Classical Poetry (Lond. 1880), and studies by A. Pfizmaier, L. de Rosny, R. Lange, etc., have been mentioned by Gayley and Scott, pp. 517–518. W. G. Aston's Japanese Lit. (Lits. of the World Series) offers a convenient introduction in English, and K. Florenz's Die japanische Lit. (in Hinneberg, T. I Abt. VII. 1906), in German. On popular poetry see Lafcadio Hearn, Japanese Folk-Songs (in *Atlantic Mo.*, 78: 347 ff.). For translations, see Baumgartner's list, and other works given below, Appendix; also two recent volumes: F. V. Dickins, Early Japanese Poetry and Romance (Oxford: 1913); W. N. Porter, A Hundred Verses from Old Japan (Oxford: 1913). In the Wisdom of the East Series (John Murray, Lond.) is Clara A. Walsh's The

Master-Singers of Japan. Of Japanese collections, the most important is the Mañyefushifu, or 'Collection of Myriad Leaves,' compiled during the first half of the eighth century. Many others were made in obedience to imperial orders during the period from the tenth to the fifteenth century; as a whole they are known as the 'Collections of the One-and-Twenty Reigns.'

As in the case of the Chinese, the bulk of Japanese poetry is lyrical. The creative period was the oldest, — before the tenth century of our era. The centuries of greatest literary output, except in respect of the lyric, were the eleventh, twelfth, and thirteenth. At the commencement of that epoch the sources of true lyric poetry suddenly dried up. "Thenceforward, instead of the heart-outpourings of the older poets, we find nothing but empty prettinesses and conceits, confined within the narrowest limits." To this critical epoch succeeded a second, critical and antiquarian, distinguished by research and collection of the old literature, — an age that extended through the two centuries preceding the arrival of the Americans and the opening of Japan to foreign influences.

XXXIII. **Lower Races.**

The study of the lyric expression of the lower and so-called 'primitive' races, bringing us as it does near to the beginnings, if not origins, of the lyric, should perhaps have been given the first place in these historical notes. But such a position would have suggested a general arrangement of poetic materials in the order of development, which clearly would be incompatible with what for us is still the most perspicuous outline, that by nationalities. At this point, therefore, may be inserted a brief consideration of the lyrics of such lower races as the Andamanese, Veddas, Australians, Malays, Africans, Esquimaux, and North and South American Indians.

Upon applying himself to this phase of the subject the student will encounter certain preliminary and peculiar difficulties. (1) How may the lower races be classified so that we may avoid confusing the lyric productions of widely differing cultural conditions? The primitive Andamanese must not be put on a level with the Malay, nor the Malay on a par with the ancient Mexican. What are the available bases for cultural differentiation? The anthropologist, believing that his data are too meagre to warrant classification according to stages of development, for the present contents himself with careful study of small social groups and looks askance at all efforts to schematize the levels of culture. But if the study of early poetry is to be comparative, some method must be devised for checking the wider divergences. The following attempts at division should therefore be studied: E. Grosse, Beginnings of Art (N.Y.: 1897), p. 35 ff., suggestion of classification on the basis of productive industry; L. T. Hobhouse, G. C. Wheeler, M. Ginsberg, The Material Culture and Social Institutions of the Simpler Peoples (Lond.: 1915), — on basis of methods of securing food; L. H. Morgan, Ancient Society (Chicago: 1877), — on basis of useful arts; Herbert Spencer, Principles of Sociology (Lond.: 1876 +), — on basis of forms of government; W. Wundt, Elements of Folk Psychology (Eng. trans. by E. L. Schaub, Lond.: 1916), — on psychological basis. For an attempt to define the savage see A. Lang, Myth, Ritual and Religion (Silver ed., p. 34, note). (2) In view of the well-known paucity of our collections of the lyrics of these peoples, can we draw any trustworthy inductions? (3) To what extent may we believe that the collections we do possess are authentic and truly representative? The great difficulty of winning the confidence of these races, understanding their language and, what is more important, their point of view, has proverbially been the cause of our failure to discover and interpret primitive songs and customs. We have fallen back upon inadequate methods, and reported half-spurious, inexact, and even prejudiced results. Superficial travelers and missionaries whose zeal for certain definite ends has not rendered them ideal observers, have not seldom provided us with such garbled versions or unrepresentative compositions as to render induction precarious. The student should base his observations only upon songs that have been reported by trained and reliable collectors, especially anthropologists. Fortunately the amount of such material is steadily increasing. (4) In his ignorance of the native languages can the literary student trust to the literal fidelity of the translations with which he must work? He must always distrust 'poetic' translations: their very smoothness "gives them away." Literal, interlinear translations of the originals should be exhausted before passing to other translations. If he observe this advice faithfully, the student will find himself well enough acquainted with the general characteristics of the poetry of lower races to detect and discard the colored rendering. (5) Does not the characteristically allusive, abbreviated style of the songs of these races render them obscure to our understanding? Obviously a wide understanding of the general psychology and sociology of the lower races — such as is to be gained from the works of J. G. Frazer, A. Lang, E. B. Tylor, Sidney Hartland, Boas, Wundt, and Westermarck (see below for references) — will minimize this obstacle.

Passing from preliminary difficulties, we may enumerate some of the objects of the study here contemplated. (1) The lyrics, once assembled and perhaps differentiated according to cultural levels, must be classified (on each level). The proper principle of division is that of occasion or purpose, for one of the most salient features of early song is its prevailingly occasional character (cf. ancient Greek and Provençal lyrics). Here, too, one may note whether occasions become more varied and plentiful as civilization advances; to what degree the occasions are social (communal) rather than individual, and how this degree differs in the lower and higher races; the extent to which the occasional song is magical; and when and how the utility of occasion is coincident with or yields to the urge of free, aesthetic expression. (2) After determining his classes and arranging therein his materials, the student should compare his divisions with the sub-types of the lyric as they are commonly but loosely recognized. Relations will at once become obvious, e.g. between the primitive wedding song and the epithalamium, the death song and the threnodic elegy, the courting song and the erotic elegy, the proverb and the epigram, the religious dance-song and the choral ode. How are the similarities to be explained? How, and this is more important, the differences of content, construction, utterance, and accompaniment? How have changed conditions — religious, political, economic — influenced the early occasion-types? To what extent has the early purpose or occasion of some song (such as the magical food-song or totemic initiation-song), which is perfectly clear to primitive participants, been forgotten, misinterpreted, conventionalized in the higher levels of culture? Are such changes regular methods of the variation or growth of the early occasion-types? (3) Again, instead of working forward from the lyric occasion-types, we may work backward by considering the development of the classes in respect of communal and individual authorship. Some division of the songs upon the basis of authorship may be possible when we have a systematic collection and interpretation of early lyrics. (4) The relation of the song to the dance, the rhythmic construction of the verses, the harmony of stanzaic effects and refrains, the general technical patterning of lyrical expression, must be investigated comparatively before the questions suggested above under (2) can be treated exhaustively. (5) Here, also, belongs the analytical study of content (images, ideas, and emotions) and treatment (including figures, rhetorical ornament, exaggeration and idealization, suspense, acme, and other technical means). The study of content, again, may be divided into the enumeration of the actual objects mentioned in the song and the determination of the kinds of thought that are found (such as associated images, simple predications, comparisons, generalizations, examples, inferences, definitions, and divisions). Is the food song the most primitive? Are love songs, war and mourning songs, of later appearance? Is the love song at first a mere melody with meaningless vocables? What of the subordination of meaning to rhythm, of the content of the song to the enjoyment of the dance? Are reflective songs found side by side with songs of spontaneous emotion and magical or occasional utility? satirical songs? retrospective and descriptive songs? songs with a narrative content? Are song and narrative actually differenced? How and when? How and when does the song of personal subjectivity appear? (6) What examples of a poetic dialect may be found? Is the poetic dialect always a taboo language, as in some songs that are chanted during the collection of certain sorts of food? How does poetic dialect develop? (7) What is the influence of oral transmission upon the form and content of the song? (8) On the comparative study of repetition and parallelism, see Biedermann, above, § 5, and compare Newman and Popper as cited under xxx, above.

When such analysis as this is carried forward comparatively to later stages of culture, and its results are associated with types of social environment, it may become possible somewhat clearly to define the terms lyric, folk poetry, primitive poetry, art poetry, popular poetry (i.e. poetry of the people in the higher stages of civilization).

References. 1. *General accounts of primitive customs and beliefs.* The most important are: J. G. Frazer, The Golden Bough (3d ed. 11 vols. Lond.: 1907–15); E. B. Tylor, Primitive Culture (2 vols. 1871); W. Wundt, Völkerpsychologie (2 vols. in 5. Leipz.: 1900–09; see also the English trans. of a shorter work, Elements of Folk Psychology, tr. E. L. Schaub, Lond.: 1916); L. T. Hobhouse, G. C. Wheeler, and M. Ginsberg, as noted above; F. Boas, The Mind of Primitive Man (N.Y.: 1913). See also Bücher, Arbeit und Rhythmus (3d ed. 1902); Karl Groos, Die Spiele der Tiere (1896) and Die Spiele der Menschen (1899); S. Hartland, Legend of Perseus; A. Lang, Myth, Ritual and Religion (2 vols. Lond.: 1887); Sir John Lubbock, Prehistoric Times (1865; later eds.); F. Müller, Allgemeine Ethnologie (1879); Herbert Spencer, Principles of Sociology; F. Ratzel, The History of Mankind (Eng. trans. 3 vols. Lond.: 1897); Waitz and Gerland, Anthropologie der Naturvölker (1859–73); A. Vierkandt, Naturvölker und Kulturvölker (Leipz.: 1896). See also the *Jr. Anthrop. Inst. of Grt. Brit.*, *Revue d'Anthrop.* (Paris), *Zeitschr. f. Ethnol.* (Berlin), etc.

2. *Reliable accounts of particular tribes.* For guidance the student may turn to the work by Hobhouse, Wheeler, and Ginsberg, noted above; also to articles and bibliographies in the 11th edition of the Encyclopaedia Britannica, such as the following: Indians, North American (by A. F. Chamberlain), which contains long tables of tribes and authorities; America, III *Ethnology and Archaeology*; Negro; Africa, *Ethnology*; Polynesia; Samoa; Hawaii; Australia, *Aborigines*; and briefer articles on particular tribes or peoples, a list of which is given in vol. XXIX, p. 883. But the brief bibliographies must be supplemented with other important works, and for publications later than 1909 the reviews of the anthropological journals must be consulted. For instance, the article on the Veddas in the Britannica neglects to mention P. and F. Sarasin, Ergebnisse wissenschaftlicher Forschungen auf Ceylon, Bd. 3: Die Weddas (1892 +), and was written before the appearance of C. G. Seligmann's The Veddas (Univ. of Cambridge: 1911). See also the Handbook of Am. Indians. — For a long list of works upon European folk-poetry, and of collections, see Paul's Grundr. d. germ. Phil., 2d ed., 2: 1, 1135 ff.: Scandinavian 1138 ff., German and Netherlandish 1178 ff. See also works listed at the close of the former subdivisions of this section.

3. *Studies of primitive poetry.* For a brief review see E. Schmidt as noted above, § 5; for longer treatises, which, however, are not limited to the poetry of the lower races, see Grosse, Gummere (Begs. of Poetry), and Posnett, above, § 5; also Hirn, Jacobowski, Mackenzie, and Macculloch, below, § 11. Before an adequate study can be undertaken a more comprehensive and critical collection of primitive songs must be made. Mr. Guy Montgomery, of the University of California, is now preparing such a collection. On primitive music see Wallaschek, Primitive Music (Lond.: 1893); C. Engel, Introduction to the Study of National Music (Lond.: 1866), and Literature of National Music (Lond.: 1879); M. V. Portman, Andamanese Music (in *Jr. Royal Asiatic Soc.*, vol. XX).

XXXIV. Special Forms.

A. *The Elegy.*

There is no satisfactory work covering scientifically the history of the elegy as a whole. The articles in most of the encyclopedias are very brief; Charles Le Goffic, however, has written for La Grande Encyclopédie an informing account of the Greek, Roman, and French Elegy; and in Larousse's Grand Dictionnaire Universel (vol. VII,

1870) is an enjoyable, enthusiastic description of ancient and modern elegy, carried to considerable length, with much appreciative criticism and citation; for Mary Lloyd's sketch see above, § 5. For the ancient elegy (Greek, Alexandrian, and Roman) the article by Crusius (above, § 5) is exhaustive and illuminating. Other works dealing with various periods of elegiac development are noted below; if names of authors are given without titles see §§ 2 or 5, or the Index, for further information.

1. *Origin of the Elegy*. As we have already noticed, the elegy has not always been restricted to the song of sorrow. It has comprised songs of martial, patriotic, erotic, convivial, and even didactic character. In attempting to determine the nature of the original poem from which the later elegy sprang, the student may pursue three lines of inquiry. (1) The evidence suggested by the derivation of the term 'elegy.' See Crusius, K. F. Smith, Flach 157–158, Wackernagel 3d ed. 170–171. (2) The early history of the elegiac distich. When did it first receive the name *elegos*? See Crusius, Zacher (*Philologus*, 57: 8 ff.). On the independent use of the pentameter see Usener, Altgriech. Versbau, 99; K. F. Smith (*A J P*, 22: 165–194); O. Immisch, Philologenversammlung zu Görlitz, p. 380 (1889); Rasi, De Eleg. Lat., p. 36; Reitzenstein, Pauly-Wissowa, Real-Encyc., VI, 76. (3) Theories, traditional and critical, of the origin of the sub-type. The primitive pre-literary origins of the elegy are a subject of speculation. Perhaps the most probable conjecture is that which apprehends the germ in early songs of lamentation for the dead and of the call to arms (to avenge the dead?). Compare the early Ionian use of the pentameter for the dirge, and see Iliad 24: 725 ff. See Crusius; Christ, Metrik 312, Gr. Lit. § 93; and Zacher as noted under (2) above. The traditional association of the elegy with the flute has suggested patriotic ecstasy (orgiastic) as a possible origin. See F. Dümmler, *Philologus*, 53: 201 = Kl. Schr. 2: 405 ff.; cf. Immisch, *op. cit.*, on the Cypris-Adonis cult; Rohde, 2d ed., 149, Note, on the musical delivery of the ancient elegy, — a note that very conveniently collects the ancient evidence upon this point; and Böttiger, in Wieland's *Att. Museum*, 1: 292, on the relation

of the elegy to ancient Lydian war songs. The elegy was in historical times associated with the *symposium*, and therefore it has been conjectured that its origin is to be sought in the customs surrounding the *symposia*; on the "sympotic" origin compare K. O. Müller, Hist. Lit. of Anc. Greece, and Reitzenstein, Epigramm und Skolion (1893). Other theories, with less probability, suggest primitive magical songs (C. Dilthey, Anal. Callim. p. 46, Sent. 1) or satirical verse (H. Usener, Altgr. Versbau, 113) as the origin. On the relation of the elegy to the epic — elegy as epic-lyric (cf. above, § 1, IV, F) — see Crusius, Wackernagel, Boeckh, Müller, Jebb, Mure, Carriere (Die Kunst 2: 116), etc.; and compare what Rohde (2d ed., 151) has to say on the elegy as supplying the need of a more subjective form of narrative than the epic. A valuable study might be made of the various forms that this epic-lyric exigency has developed in different literatures; see Rohde's note on this subject (*loc. cit.*).

2. *The Old Greek Elegy* (*600–300 B.C.*).

See Crusius, Christ (Gr. Lit.), Jevons, K. F. Smith, Jebb, K. O. Müller, Mahaffy, Bernhardy, etc. Further bibliography in Crusius and Christ. Bernhardy, Th. 2, Abt. 1, p. 463 ff., gives annotated references from Abbé Souchay (1726) to C. I. Caesar (1837), and also, *passim*, the older references for the various elegists. For a study of Mimnermus, see G. Vanzolini, Mimnermo (1883), which includes a verse translation of the fragments. Bergk's Poetae Lyrici Graeci is, of course, the great repository for Greek lyric, including elegiac, poetry; see also the edition by Hartung, noted above, § 5. Editions, translations, and monographs are cited by P. Masqueray, Bibliographie pratique de la litt. grecque, p. 52 ff. (Paris: 1914).

Already in the old Ionian school (seventh and sixth centuries), to which belonged Archilochus, Callinus, and Mimnermus, almost the full variety of subjects that characterized the ancient elegy is apparent. Their fragments contain funereal, martial, philosophical, and didactic elements; and in his poems to Nanno, Mimnermus furnishes, also, the prototype of the sentimental-erotic elegy of the Alexandrian and all later, including modern, poems of similar character. A detailed study of the Nanno poems might well be followed by an extensive inquiry into the actual variations (together with their causes) by which the sentimental-erotic type has progressed. To what extent has it been plaintive, thus supporting the French view (cf. Larousse, Art. *Élégie*) that a plaintive note, whether of love or death or misfortune, or melancholy, is the essential characteristic of the elegy? It should be noted that Mimnermus does not express emotion in the direct, presentative fashion of the Aeolic lyric (see above, 1, (3)) but analytically and rhetorically (cf. the old gnomic poetry of Greece). He also illustrates his subjects with parallels from myths. In all these respects he is followed by the Alexandrians. The Ionian elegy should be compared not only with the Aeolic lyric but also the Doric, and with the Ionian epic, as respects objectivity, emotional tendencies, style, and narrative-lyric proclivities.

Three other schools of the elegy belong to this period: the Dorian school of the Peloponnesus; Solon, Theognis, and their contemporaries; and the Attic school. To the first school belong the rough war elegies of Tyrtaeus. At the time of Solon the elegiac distich was applied to inscriptions and epitaphs (cf. its threnodic mood). Simonides, Aeschylus, and Phrynicus developed this variation. To both Solon and Theognis, perhaps, may be traced some of the chief characteristics of the Augustan elegy, such as satirical purpose, praise of abstract ideas, and erotic application of myth (A. L. Wheeler, *infra*). But during the Attic period the elegy declined, because, perhaps, of the newly awakened interest in the drama. A plaintive note in these late elegies should be traced, possibly, to the questioning spirit of the times, the age of Euripides and the Sophists.

While following the development of the old Greek elegy one should endeavor to reach some conclusion as to how far the changing political and social conditions of the period, and the growth of individualism, were responsible for the gradual democratization and differentiation of the poetic sub-type, and to what extent particular strains — such as the erotic, the pathetic, or the satirical — were due to the idiosyncrasies of particular authors, — Mimnermus, Simonides, Xenophanes, etc. Especially suggestive is the decline of the war elegy and the rise of the political and sentimental elegy as Greece passed to cosmopolitan ideals of the state and the individual. Again, by what degrees did the elegy tend to lose its musical accompaniment, and what were the causes of this most important variation — the inappropriateness of melody to the elegiac metre as recognized in a more highly individualistic, less communal, age, or the change in the character of the elegy from a song fit for occasional extemporization to a work of polished art?

3. *The New or Alexandrian Elegy* (*300 B.C. to the Christian era*).

See Crusius, Christ (Gr. Lit.), K. O. Müller, Susemihl, Couat, Bernhardy, Jebb, Jacoby, K. F. Smith, etc.; further references in Crusius, Christ, and Bernhardy, and in P. Masqueray's Bibliog. pratique de la litt. grecque (p. 244 ff.). For a collection of the Hellenistic elegiac fragments, see Hartung (vol. II); A. Meineke, Analecta Alexandrina (1843). On Callimachus see the references cited above, 1, (8); on the pastoral elegy, see the article by Hanford, noted above, § 5, P. E. Legrand's Étude sur Théocrite (Paris: 1898), W. P. Trent in *Sewanee Rev.*, 1: 410–418, 6: 1–28, 257–275, and articles on pastoral poetry in general as listed below (§ 10).

In this period the elegy becomes very popular and undergoes many variations. Antimachus of Colophon, who in his poems to Lyde imitated Mimnermus' use of illustrative myths, affords the transition to the new elegy. Among the characteristic variations of the type the following should be observed: reduction of the personal note until the illustrative myth becomes the principal subject of the poem, — in other words, the emphasis of narrative and descriptive elements; the expansion of the narrative elegy to include love-stories and gossip, and popular legend rather than myth (Alexander the Aetolian), with a tendency to restrict the narrative to the most telling episodes, especially the catastrophe, — a tendency that in its general cause and aim suggests the method of the modern short-story; emphasis of erotic and sentimental gallantry, with addition of irony and persiflage; great elaboration of details, mastery of formal excellence, until the elegy becomes the most polished and pointed of poetic exercises, — a *vers de société*; development of the elegiac epigram (see Reitzenstein); rise of an archaistic and *fin de siècle* return-to-nature movement (Callimachus, the representative elegist of Hellenism), and the rise of the pastoral and romantic elegy (Theocritus, Bion, Moschus); variations in verse structure, such as the employment of hexameters in both lines of the distich and an exaggerated use of spondees, — important as contributing to the break-up of the formal unity of the type. For the general causes lying behind these changes the student will again turn to the social and political environment, in order to note the rise of commercialism and a wealthy, luxurious, and more or less carnal upper class, and to contrast the resulting artificiality and sophistication of culture with the simpler ideals and standards of comfort that prevailed in ancient Greece. The spirit of the new age, perhaps rather near in certain essentials to the spirit of the later nineteenth century, is clearly reflected in the growth of the elegy. A specific topic of social interest is found in the relation of the new elegy to the feminization of life under Hellenistic cosmopolitism. Contrast this Hellenistic feminization with the more modest place of woman in the old Greek city-state. Compare the effect of a similar feminization of Roman life under the Empire upon the work of Ovid. Several of the more important of the Alexandrian elegists may be mentioned here in addition to those already noted: Philetas of Cos, the greatest, but no remains; Hermesianax and Phanocles; Aratus, Eratosthenes, Philostephanus, Nicander, Euphorion of Chalcis; and Parthenius of Nicaea, the last great elegist of the school, who in 72 B.C. was carried captive to Rome and became the teacher of Gallus, the first to make popular in Rome a Latinized form of the Alexandrian elegy. — On Callimachus see above (I, (8)). With regard to the pastoral elegy it should be noted that the first idyl of Theocritus contains a charming lament for the death of Daphnis that is "in many respects the archetype of pastoral elegy" (Hanford, *op. cit. supra*, § 5), and that Bion's Lament for Adonis and Moschus' Lament for Bion are only second to the Daphnis poem in their influence upon the Arcadian elegies of the Renaissance and of later European literature (see below, 6). In following the development of the pastoral elegy it becomes necessary, of course, to abstract from the types most characteristically pastoral, viz., the idyl and eclogue, those passages which are plaintive (erotic or threnodic) in character.

A question of special interest, because of its bearing upon the originality of the Roman elegy, is whether or not the erotic elegy of the subjective type was known to the Alexandrian poets. This is the specific type of the Roman elegy, and our earliest examples of it are in Latin. Did the Romans derive this form from the Alexandrians? See M. Pohlenz, Die hellenistische Poesie und die Philosophie (in **Χάριτες** Friedrich Leo zum sechzigsten Geburtstag dargebracht, Berlin: 1911); further references in K. F. Smith, 23 Note, — especially that to Gollnisch, Quaestiones Elegiacae (Diss. Breslau: 1905), which contains bibliography up to 1905; R. Reitzenstein; F. Jacoby; A. L. Wheeler, *Class. Phil.* 5: 440–450, 6: 56–77, 5: 28–40; Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, as noted below, under 4.

Special notice may here be made of Plessis' conception of the relation of the Alexandrian elegy to earlier and later forms. This writer maintains that among the ancients as among the moderns the term 'elegy' connoted lamentation. Hence he disregards both the warlike elegy of the Ionian and Doric schools and the gnomic poetry of Solon, Theognis, and the Attic school. In Mimnermus he discovers the familiar themes of the elegy: the sovereign gentleness of love, the bitterness without consolation of old age, the ephemerality of pleasure, and the horror of death. But to the Alexandrians the type owes its development; among them the elegy grew nearer to the conception adopted in the Roman and modern worlds. And yet the compositions of Callimachus and Philetas, because of their impersonality and objectivity, were perhaps elegiac poems rather than elegies; the Alexandrian poem of amours was probably still very much of an epigram. By the Romans, then, was developed in all the perfection of its traits the poem of personal passion which has ever since been known as the elegy proper.

In later Greek poetry (A.D. 100–530) elegy is lacking; but erotic themes develop in the prose romance and in the epigram (see W. von Christ, Gr. Lit., 5th ed. (W. Schmid), Th. 2, Hälfte 2. München: 1913). The student who wishes to pursue the Greek elegy into still later, Byzantine ages (530–1453) should consult K. Krumbacher's Gesch. der byzantinischen Lit. (2d. ed., A. Ehrhard and H. Gelzer, München: 1897).

4. *The Roman Elegy.*

See Crusius, Schanz, Teuffel, Sellar, Plessis, Cruttwell, Duff, K. F. Smith, O. F. Gruppe, F. Jacoby, Gollnisch (as above), Schulze, Haupt, Zingerle; P. Troll, De Elegiae Romanae Origine (Göttingen: 1911); Wilamowitz, in Kult. d. Gegenw., T. I, Abt. VIII 215 (3d ed., 1912), and, in the same work, the remarks by Leo, p. 448 ff.; P. Rasi, De Carmine Romanorum Elegiaco (Patavii: 1890); R. Pichon, De Sermone Amatorio apud Latinos Elegiarum Scriptores (Diss. Paris: 1902); A. L. Wheeler, Erotic Teaching in Roman Elegy and the Greek Sources (in *Class. Philol.* 5: 447 ff.), and Catullus as an Elegist (in *American Jr. of Philol.* 36: 155. 1915); J. Davies, Catullus, Tibullus, and Propertius (Philadelphia: 1876(?)); Sciacia, L'Arte in Catullo (Palermo: 1896). Further references in Crusius and Schanz. *Critical editions* of Tibullus by Postgate (1905) and Hiller (Tauchnitz, 1909); annotated by Lachmann-Dissenius (1835), H. Belling, with extended commentary (1897), and K. F. Smith (N.Y.: 1913). Editions of Propertius by Rothstein (1898) and Phillimore (1901). See also Postgate's selections from Tibullus, and from Propertius; G. G. Ramsay's selections from the same; H. E. Butler's edition of Propertius complete (Lond.: 1905). The Amores of Ovid is edited by Némethy; the Heroides by Palmer (1898) and Sedlmayer (1886); the Tristia by Owen (1889); the Ex Ponto by Korn (1868). For Catullus see the editions of Haupt-Vahlen (7th ed., 1912) and Merrill (1893). For later elegists see J. C. Wernsdorf, Poetae Latini Minores, and E. Bährens, Poetae Latini Minores. For English translations see Bohn's Classical Library, Loeb Classical Library, Cranstoun's metrical version of Propertius (Edinb.: 1875), and the metrical versions of Catullus by Sir Theodore Martin and Robinson Ellis.

Cornelius Gallus (69–26 B.C.), the pupil of the Alexandrian elegist Parthenius of Nicaea (see above, 3), is generally regarded as the founder of the Roman elegy. To be sure Ennius (239–169 B.C.) was the first to use the elegiac metre in Rome (for eulogy, inscriptions, and epigrams); and Lucilius (180–103 B.C.) had employed it in the second book of his Satires for an epitaph on a slave and to express the joys of love and companionship. Earlier also than the elegies of Gallus were the Hellenistic epigrams in distichs of Catulus, Valerius Aedituus, and others (second century before Christ), and the genuine elegies of Catullus and, probably, Calvus and Varro Atacinus. But it is held that Gallus was the first to write the characteristically Roman form of the sub-type, viz., *the subjective erotic elegy*. With the growth of this variety after Gallus are associated the names of Tibullus, Propertius, and Ovid. The study of the Roman elegy is primarily the study of these three poets, the greatest Roman masters of melodious and sensuous verse. But whether this specifically Roman elegy was derived from lost Alexandrian models, perhaps by way of the lost poems of Gallus, or, as is now maintained (Jacoby, Wilamowitz), was originally developed by Gallus out of the Alexandrian erotic epigrams, with additions from certain other minor poetic types, must be an open question. Reference to this question has already been made above, under the Alexandrian elegy, *q.v.* It is difficult to say just what the Romans may have added to their models, especially in view of the fact that the Roman social life that furnished the environment and encouragement to this species of poetry was very similar to that reflected in the Alexandrian varieties. Again, the possibility of relationship, especially upon the part of Tibullus, and of the elegists before Gallus, to the Attic school must be considered (see Gollnisch, Jacoby, K. F. Smith; and R. Bürger, Beiträge zur Elegantia Tibulls, in the Χάριτες F. Leo . . ., already mentioned). Wilamowitz, however, contends that Propertius and Tibullus created a new elegy (as cited above; also his Sappho und Simonides, p. 303. Berlin: 1913). At any rate the student may note in the

Roman elegies a certain superiority in spontaneous, lyric inspiration, which does not, however, interfere with the extreme polish of thought and music. Whether or not the Roman elegy shows a greater depth and sincerity along with this new freshness of spirit (see Propertius, especially), and whether it displays the signs of an art that is in its pristine, creative stage, are allied questions. Most important for the history of the type is the decay of the glorious motives of the heroic past which had played so great a part in the old Greek elegy, and the restriction in the main to motives drawn from present-day pleasures and pains of the erotic sort. May a decay in Roman patriotism and a revulsion from the preceding period of bloodshed be assigned as the cause for this restriction, or is the general luxury of Alexandrian and Roman society to be regarded as inevitably registering its *morale* in this narrowing of the elegy? To what extent is the melancholy note of the elegy — the vanity of human ambitions — present in the Roman elegy? — To Ovid, "the most brilliant representative of Roman Alexandrianism," particular attention must be paid because he is the world's greatest master of the elegiac couplet. Most of his poems were written in this measure, and thus was emphasized once again the great variety of purpose for which the elegiac distich may be employed. By putting it to threnodic and epistolary, narrative and descriptive, panegyric and invective uses Ovid became influential in the wide adoption of the measure throughout the Dark and Middle Ages for occasional verse of all kinds (see below). Indeed, the impetus which he gave to the later cultivation of the distich by the schools and literati of Europe, in modern as well as medieval times, is one of the outstanding features in the history of the elegy (references in Teuffel, Schanz, etc.). — The modification of the metrical form of the old distich, begun by the Hellenistic poets, was continued in Tibullus, Propertius, and Ovid, by the introduction, or perhaps one should say reduction, of variations in stress and in line composition, and by an arrangement of thought within the distich. These variations should be studied at length since they represent in a tangible way the general growth of the elegy. See K. F. Smith, pp. 98–106. — For other Roman elegists see Crusius. We may note here that contemporary with Tibullus, Propertius, and Ovid, were Valgius Rufus, who was consul 12 B.C., Codrus, the friend of Virgil, and Domitius Marsus. For Horace's light evaluation of the *exiguos elegos* see lines 75–78 of the so-called Ars Poetica (Ad Pisones); it is to be remembered that Horace was opposed to Alexandrianism. He associates the term 'elegy' with the expression of sorrow and with the inscription of votive offerings. Of the erotic poems of Proculus and Alfius Flavus (Teuffel-Schwabe, § 254) nothing remains. Later, erotic elegies were composed by Arruntius Stella, the friend of Statius, and by Sulpicia. In the fourth century Ausonius wrote idyls in distichs; in the sixth Maximianus lamented the loss of his youth and amours, and by this time all sorts of puerilities, acrostics, and the like were written in distichs. Thus eventually the Roman distich lost the sentimental connotation of the *tristis elegeïa*. Consider this statement by Postgate: "By the time of Quintilian the elegiac couplet developing, as would appear, the character which the witty and heartless Ovid had impressed upon it, had broken with sentiment and become the proper vehicle of the epigram." Compare the use of the elegiac couplet in the Greek Anthology (see below, XXXIV, B, The Epigram). For Quintilian's notice of the elegy, see the Institutes X, 93. — To what extent are threnodic poems in other metres to be found in later Roman literature? See, e.g., Statius, Silvae, II, iv; V, i.

The student should also note Virgil's contributions to the pastoral elegy. The love lament in his tenth Eclogue and the lament for Daphnis (probably Julius Caesar) in the fifth Eclogue reveal the conventionalized pastoral form and the highly refined artistic finish that characterize the later history of the pastoral elegy (see Hanford, cited above, § 5). For a later Roman pastoral elegy see the Epiphunus Meliboei attributed to Nemesianus (C. H. Keene, The Eclogues of Calpurnius Siculus and M. Aurelius Nemesianus, Lond.: 1887; M. Haupt, De Carminibus

Bucolicis Calpurnii et Nemesiani, 1853; L. Cisorio, Studio sulle egloghe di N., 1895; by the same, Dell' imitazione nelle egloghe di N., 1896).

5. *Latin Christian Elegy to the 12th Century.*

For literary history, see Ebert (vols. II, III) and Manitius (see above, § 5). For texts, J. P. Migne, Patrologia Latina (221 vols. Paris: 1844–64); the Monumenta Germaniae Historical (Hannover and Berlin: 1826 +), especially the Poetae Latini Aevi Carolini (3 vols., ed. E. Dümmler, vols. I, II, and L. Traube, vol. III). Also, for texts of Latin popular poetry, the two collections of Du Méril. On Theodulf, the principal poet of the age of Charlemagne, see the references noted above, V, B. The articles in the Encyclopaedia Britannica on the various writers are also helpful and point the way to further bibliography.

(*a*) *To the Time of Charlemagne.* During its early struggle for existence the Christian church placed Greek and Roman literature under the ban of heathenism. But after its recognition by Constantine Christianity began to assimilate more and more of the literary culture of Greece and Rome (see below, § 12, IV, B, and Ebert, vol. I, Introductions to Books II, III). The adoption of classical models and forms naturally followed; but the elegiac distich was at first used only to a slight extent. To trace its rise the student should consult the histories of Ebert and Manitius, the famous Latin collection of Migne, the Monumenta Germaniae Historica, and the various special editions mentioned by Ebert and Manitius. An examination of the first volume of Ebert reveals facts worthy of consideration as follows: several of the epigrams of Damasus, who was Pope from 366 to 384, are in distichs (vol. 1, p. 128); Paulinus of Nola (353–431) composes an epithalamium in distichs, and an elegy on the death of a certain Celsus (1 : 306–307); the introduction to the De Providentia Divina (2d decade, 5th cent.) is in distichs (1 : 317); the hexametrical paraphrase, Metrum in Genesin, is prefaced with a dedication consisting of three distichs (1 : 369); Sedulius (first half of the 5th cent.), an imitator of Virgil, is responsible for a strange elegy in praise of Christ, each hexameter stating the Old Testament antetype or prophecy and the succeeding pentameter the New Testament analogue or fulfilment (1: 379–380); Dracontius (latter part of the 5th cent.) addresses an elegy to the Vandal king Gunthamund, praying for release from prison and reflecting upon the mercy and the wrath of God (1: 385); the Commonitorium of Orientius is a didactic treatment of the theme of immortality (1: 410 ff.); Merobaudes writes panegyrical elegies, and Sidonius also uses the distich (1: 417 ff.); from Ennodius we have a begging letter and a descriptive poem in distichs (1: 434); Boethius (*c.* 480–524) opens his De Consolatione Philosophiae with a beautiful elegy descriptive of his misfortunes (1: 490); in the eleven books of his occasional poetry — panegyrics, epitaphs, epigrams, and epistles — Fortunatus (530–609), most important of the Christian elegists before Charlemagne, employs the distich as a maid of all work; but in three longer poems, all melancholy in character, written under the inspiration of his friend Queen Radegunda of Poitiers — works of signal merit — he definitely adapts the rhetorical art of which the Roman elegy is capable to a profound and sincere expression of the Germanic spirit (1: 520, 533); the distichs of Eugenius II, toward the middle of the following century, remind one of Fortunatus, and show a tendency toward a metrical variation already noticeable in Fortunatus (1: 603–604).

From these examples, and it should be the first concern of the student to increase their number so far as possible by research in the sources suggested above, it may perhaps be inferred that the Latin Christian elegy up to the time of Charlemagne is gradually increasing in popularity and shows a constant tendency toward an uncritical application of the distich to a great variety of *occasional* subjects, a far more slender application to threnodic subjects, a slight use for narrative purposes, an avoidance of the erotic — the favorite subject among Roman elegists — and a neglect of the pastoral; and, toward the end, a tendency to break up the distich with capricious prosodical additions and substitutions. At any rate, such inferences as these may serve as suggestions for special investigation. Certainly the examples cited seem to show that the use of the distich for a great variety of subjects, which had already begun in the Hellenistic Age, and was characteristic of later Roman poetry, was signally extended by early Christian writers, largely because of their critical ignorance. It can scarcely be said, then, that viewed as a whole the early Christian elegy supplies a more vital stage of the type — reinvigorating the classical form with a new and more profound spirit; it merely purifies the moral atmosphere of the type by avoiding eroticism.

(*b*) *In the Time of Charlemagne, and until the 12th Century.* The rise of the schools of Charlemagne (see above, V, B) increased the knowledge and practice of classical metres while Charlemagne and his court were becoming the inspiration of a new secular poetry. Thus the scope of Latin Christian poetry was expanded in both form and subject. What part did the elegy take in this Carolingian renaissance? Primarily the distich remained what it had become in the hands of Fortunatus, the chief instrument for occasional verse. But its employment was extended to new courtly and military subjects, particularly to panegyrics of kings and generals. It continued to be a popular metre for such productions as epistles, epitaphs, prologues and epilogues, epigrams, and didactic themes. Of the threnodic distich examples are rare (Agius' elegy, in dialogue, on the death of his sister, an abbess, written about 875; see Ebert 2: 294). One of the two elegies addressed by Ermoldus Nigellus to King Pippin takes on a melancholy tone through reference to the banishment of the author (Ebert 2: 176 ff.). A good example of the sacred elegy addressed to the praise of God is that of Idericus, which also is in the form of a dialogue (2: 298). Worth noting, too, is the introduction of a pastoral note, perhaps as a result of the study of Virgil, in one of Alcuin's elegies (2: 30), and both Alcuin and a certain Alvarus composed elegies on the nightingale (2: 31, 310). The tenth century presents us with a new departure in the form of the distich, the addition of rhyme, including leonine rhyme, as in the occasional and threnodic compositions of

Salomo III and of the school of St. Gall (3: 153–159). This variation should be related to the development of popular metres, including the hymn; and here the use of the distich in the hymn (3: 162) is noticeable. Are such variations signs of a fresher spirit blowing from the popular, vernacular literatures? For like signs of a freer spirit see the charming elegiac verses on a swallow, and a panegyric that dares to make an ornamental use of ancient myth, both by Radbod (d. 917; 3: 185). The student should determine what Roman and Christian authors exert definite influences upon the elegiac verse of these centuries. The ascendency of Ovid (see, for example, Alcuin, Theodulf of Orleans, and Ermoldus Nigellus, all in vol. II of Ebert) and of Fortunatus (cf. the general use of the distich for occasional verse, and see the elegies on the death of the brother of Salomo III, Ebert 3: 153–155) is easily demonstrable. Are any other Roman elegiacal influences discernible? — The following additional references to Ebert, vol. II, will serve to introduce the student of this period to the sources, which should be expanded by reference to Manitius and the texts as already noted: Paulus Diaconus 48–56, Angilbert 63, Naso 65, Raban 143, Sedulius Scotus 193, Erigena 265, Florus 270, Audrad 276, Milo 278, Bertharius 298. In vol. III see pp. 153–159, 162, 185, 285 ff., 343, 497. — For an excellent example of the wide range of classical metres employed during this period see the verse passages in the De Rectoribus Christianis of Sedulius Scotus (2: 199 and Note). Ebert points out the similarity in form (prose with verse insertions of various metres) of this poem and the Consolatio of Boethius, and remarks that the latter must have been one of the sources of Christian knowledge of classical metres.

There remains one development during this period of particular importance in its bearing upon the elegy: the rise of the popular anonymous *planctus*, or song of lament, which has the quality of the threnodic elegy, but is composed in rhythmic (not quantitative) Latin verse, usually iambic trimeter. The subject is often secular in character, — the fall of a city or loss of a general (2: 87–89), or, later, the death of Charlemagne (2 : 311). One such laments the death of Hugo, abbot of St. Quentin (2 : 313). A still later planctus on the death of a churchman is noticeable for its use of the Ambrosian-hymn metre, rhymed (3 : 174). The study of such poems may be carried down to the eleventh and twelfth centuries by the help of Du Méril's two collections.

Obviously the example of these productions, elegiac in subject but not in metre, would militate against the traditional employment of the distich for threnodic subjects. Further study, however, must determine whether they actually exerted an influence in dissolving the classical convention and establishing the variety of form that characterizes the modern threnodic elegy. Can it be maintained that in this anonymous, popular planctus we have the birth of a distinctly new elegy, evoked by bereavements (secular in the first place?) commonly felt, and continuing side by side with the older growth? Does the planctus preserve a separate development, or does it merge later with the older growth? Is it the representation in Latin of the vernacular funeral lament (see below, 6, (*a*), Provençal Elegiac Poetry)? The influence of church hymn and music should not be overlooked in connection with the rise of that popular rhythmic verse in Latin of which the planctus appears to have been only one example.

6. *Modern European Elegiac Poetry.* The student of elegy in modern European literatures is faced at the outset by a difficulty of procedure already suggested in the preceding paragraphs: Is the modern elegy to be studied only so far as we can discern a direct continuation and variation of the Latin elegy? or should there be taken into consideration the rise of a vernacular poetry independent of the ancient elegy but similar to it in general content and purposes? The former method has the advantages of limiting the field and defining rather strictly the subject of inquiry; but these advantages would appear to be superficial and illusory, since they are obtained at the cost of arbitrarily circumscribing the historical data and pedantically restricting the definition of

the poetic sub-type to its ancient metrical form. On the other hand, if a new vernacular elegy in new metrical forms is to be reviewed, where may limits be placed to the variety of content of which it is capable? How much of the new vernacular verse must be taken into account? When we remember that the ancient elegy was often practically synonymous with occasional verse it seems only right that all occasional verse in the European vernaculars should be scrutinized. And in a way it must be, at least for the purpose of determining whether the inscriptional, epigrammatic, hortatory, erotic, threnodic, and didactic-epistolary strains of ancient elegy are in any way paralleled, and what tendencies of metrical form the new poetry displays. The inclination, however, of the ancient elegy to develop the erotic and threnodic moods into definite varieties or sub-types, clearly enough distinguishable from epigram, epistle, and other forms employing the distich, perhaps justifies the student in confining his attention to the development of these two moods in the modern vernaculars from the point where each emerges as fairly distinct from epistolary, epigrammatic, and reflective-didactic varieties.

If this view be historically sound the general method of investigation may be indicated as follows: (1) To study the earliest vernacular verse of each nation in order to determine what separate origin or development there may be of erotic, threnodic, epigrammatic, and didactic moods and contents. (2) To trace the separate development of erotic and threnodic themes up to the beginning of modern classical (Renaissance) influence, determining their stages and characteristic metrical forms, considering inter-vernacular influences, and also whatever influences may have related the vernacular poetry of these themes to both learned and popular late Latin verse (Dark and Middle Ages) of like content. (3) To determine when in each national literature the classical term 'elegy' is first applied to poems in the vernacular, and whether poems thus named reveal a modern classical (Renaissance) influence, or an independent, native derivation, or both.

(4) To determine to what extent after the classical term has become acclimated the modern erotic or threnodic elegy shows distinct influences from the ancient classical elegy. This division of the field corresponds to the first, or arbitrarily narrowed, method that was rejected above. This study should also include a classification according to subject of all modern verse that, though neither erotic nor threnodic, has yet employed the elegiac distich, and the comparison of the classes so determined with the full variety of subject matter embraced by the ancient distich. The study should be carried down to the present day. (5) To trace the development since the Renaissance of the threnodic and erotic poetry that has appeared in forms other than the classical distich; to determine the relation of such poetry to pre-renaissance vernacular poetry of similar content; to mark its characteristic metrical forms (such as sonnet, ode, terza rima, other stanzaic varieties, alexandrine, blank verse, etc.), its stages of development, its inclination to romantic, melancholy, epicurean, religious, classical, political, erotic-oriental themes, its relations to social and economic environment (including, for the erotic elegy, the feminization and moral-religious deterioration of society), its relation, especially in degree of subjectivity, to other divisions of the lyric, and, as regards the threnodic elegy, the degree of its inclination toward the reflective and didactic.

The study of pastoral elegy, in distichs or other metres, carries one over into that of the pastoral idyl and eclogue, as noticed above in connection with Theocritus, Bion, Moschus, Virgil, and Nemesianus. The modern development of the pastoral elegy may be followed from the Latin and vernacular pastoral poetry of the Renaissance on, through such writers as Boccaccio, Petrarch, Giovanni Battista (Mantuan), Alamanni, Bembo, Castiglione, Sannazaro, Ronsard, Marot, Spenser, Milton, and a host of others. No special notice of this development will be taken in the notes below; but an admirable brief introduction to the general field of the pastoral elegy from Theocritus to Milton is contained in the article by J. H. Hanford noted above (§ 5);

see also H. E. Cory's The Golden Age of the Pastoral. For further references the student must consult the general works bearing upon pastoral poetry (see § 7, VII, B; 10, IX, B).

It is impossible to give here a review of the elegy in all modern European literatures. Such a review would in large part necessarily be a repetition of what has been suggested under the general head of lyric, since the task of the student consists first of all in searching the lyric literatures, with the aid of the paraphernalia already summarized, for the poems that fall under any of the five divisions of study just outlined. In this search some, unfortunately inadequate, aid may be derived from the general and special histories. Only at rare intervals, and then for small fields only, will the student have the help of monographs devoted to the elegy. There is a dearth of books upon the modern elegy.

The very brief notes submitted below are intended only to start the student in his research. It is understood that the process of study just mentioned should be applied to each division of the materials here suggested.

(*a*) *Provençal Elegiac Poetry* (*1100–1250*).

For general apparatus, see above, VII, B.

European vernacular verse began in Provence, and Provence, therefore, becomes the most important field for the research indicated in the first of our five divisions. Of particular importance are the troubadours' love-songs to their mistresses and their death-plaints for their lords and ladies (cf. the *planctus*, above, 5, (*b*); among the forms to be studied are the plantes or plaintes, aubades, saluts, estampidas, cansos, etc.). Primarily a poetry of chivalric love, the Provençal lyric affords ample opportunity for the study of a distinctive development of the love theme and a comparison of it with the erotic elegy of antiquity on the one hand, and with popular love poetry (Greek, Sicilian, Modern European, etc.) on the other. A comparison with the erotic elegy of Rome is particularly informing because of the significance not only of the similarities but of the differences observable between the ingrained eroticism of a great civilization at its moment of richest but already decadent splendor and the amorous diversion of a courtly society in a rising civilization. Compare W. Schröttner, Ovid und die Troubadours (Halle a. S.: 1908); E. Faral, Recherches sur les sources latines des contes et romans courtois du moyen âge (Paris: 1913).

(*b*) *Latin Elegy from the 12th to the Close of the 18th Century.*

For general apparatus see above, v–vi; A. Schroeter and E. Costa, as noted under vi, are especially helpful. Quadrio (cited above, § 2) gives a list (35 authors) of Latin elegies from the 12th century to 1450, in vol. II, pt. i, pp. 654–658; Blankenburg-Sulzer (cited above, § 2) give a further list (over 60 authors) extending from the second half of the 15th to the close of the 18th century. Symonds devotes a chapter of his Revival of Learning (Renaissance in Italy) to the Latin poetry of the Renaissance in Italy.

In connection with the development of vernacular elegiac poetry the further history of the Latin elegy should be studied. Only so can the student acquire an adequate knowledge of the history of the elegy, for since the vernacular elegy was written side by side with late Latin elegiacs there may very likely have been an interchange of influences. In particular it should be noted that the Latin elegies descend in an unbroken line from the Dark and earlier Middle Ages, and that from the twelfth to the end of the fifteenth century, roughly speaking, they present the quality of occasional verse and the diversification of subject characteristic of the earlier Latin forms (see above, v). Now it was practically in the sixteenth century that vernacular poems with the title of elegies began to be written in the various national literatures (see below, under Italian, French, English, and German Elegiac Poetry). Debouching, then, upon this century we have not only the vernacular poems on love and death, descending from Provençal and other native inventions, but also this unbroken line of the Latin occasional elegy. It remains for someone to study the fusion of these two strains, to expound the influence of the formal revival of the ancient classical elegy, and to determine just how and in what proportion these three influences were amalgamated to produce modern elegiac poetry. Since, for instance, one of the principal offices of the late Latin elegy continued to be memorial, may evidence be adduced to prove that the funeral plaints, complaints, laments, etc. of the vernacular literatures (see above and below) took over the term elegy from that late Latin influence? Since, on the other hand, the classical elegy of Ovid, Tibullus, and Propertius was primarily erotic, may we assume that the erotic elegy of the Renaissance is purely classical in derivation? Or do the historical materials indicate a combination of the strain of native love poesy with the strain of classical Roman tradition? Does the erotic elegy of the Renaissance derive name or characteristic from the late Latin elegy? Can it be shown that from approximately the beginning of the sixteenth century the Latin elegy loses something of its diversity in subject and gradually narrows toward erotic and threnodic themes? If this movement can be proved, is it to be explained by the vitality of vernacular poems of love and death that have adopted the name of elegy? — Whatever may have been the exact provenience of modern elegy, and perhaps the whole process was too confused and varied to admit of answers to these questions, from the sixteenth century on the tendency toward narrowing the concept to erotic and obituary themes is distinct, and eventually the melancholy-reflective, or threnodic, triumphs over the erotic. The latter, however, was occasionally revived in the second half of the eighteenth century in England, Italy, and Germany, but more particularly in France. — Should the Latin Goliardic verse of the twelfth century be noticed in studying the rise of erotic themes? See above, V, E.

(*c*) *Italian Elegiac Poetry.*

Little aid is afforded by the histories of Italian literature, though Crescimbeni and Symonds indicate materials to the careful researcher. More help may be derived from several of the monographs listed above under the apparatus for the Italian lyric, to which the student is referred. Quadrio has a brief list of 16th, 17th, and 18th century elegists and of Italian translations of Jeremiah, Catullus, Ovid, Tibullus, Propertius, and the Latin elegies of Sannazaro, Pietro Bargeo, and Francesco Raimondi (cited above, § 5; see vol. II, pt. i, pp. 659–662). Blankenburg-Sulzer, also, give a short list of elegists of the same three centuries, mentioning in addition to those noticed above the following: Fabio Galeotto, Agnolo Firenzuola, Lod. Paterno, Ant. Minturno, of the 16th century; Carlo della Lengueglia, Girol. Fontanella, P. Casaburi, Bened. Menzini, of the 17th century; Gius. Salio, Vinc. Leonio, Gius. Bertòla, and Aurelio de' Giorgi Bertòla, of the 18th century. Carducci's little collection, Poeti erotici del secolo XVIII (Firenze: 1868), with its critical preface, is very helpful; the poets represented are Rolli, Metastasio, Frugoni, Crudeli, Savioli, Casti, Bertòla, De Rossi, Vittorelli. On the sepulchral poetry see B. Zumbini's La poesia sepolcrale straniera e italiana e il carme del Foscolo, in his Studi di letteratura italiana (2d ed. Firenze: 1906). For the popular elegies of love and death, see the chapters in Symonds, vol. I, devoted to popular poetry, and the monographs cited above (VIII, A, J).

For the first development of erotic themes in the art poetry of the vernacular, Italian literature is indebted to Provençal influence. In the popular poetry of the time both threnodic and erotic subjects were handled, the erotic being found particularly in the *Strambotti*, *Rispetti*, and *Stornelli*. During the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries the love theme is developed with greater ideality by the Tuscan school (*Dolce Stil Nuovo*). For this stage Dante and his circle, "spiritualizing the earthly passion of the troubadours," furnish the data. Nor are the poems of this school love-plaints only: the theme of death also recurs, as in Dante's canzone on the death of Beatrice (Vita Nuova) and in Cino da Pistoia's consolatory verses addressed to Dante in reference to the same event. From this time on terza rima is the favorite vehicle of Italian elegy. The study of the classics, especially of Ovid, during the fourteenth century is of great importance; and the advent of Petrarch, with which coincides a florescence of the erotic theme (in *canzone*, sonnet, and *capitolo*), was destined to be the supreme influence in the later history of Italian poetry of love. The similarity in spirit between Petrarch's poems and the Provençal love lyrics must be considered, nor should his relations to the ancient Roman poets be overlooked. — In the fifteenth century popular *Lamenti* were written in terza rima, as noted by Symonds (Ren. in Italy: Ital. Lit. I, 172, 255 ff. N.Y.: 1882), who cites as examples the two Lamenti of Pre Agostino which are given by Mutinelli, Annali urbani di Venezia, pp. 352–356. "Both Benivieni and Michelangelo Buonarroti," continues Symonds, "composed elegies in this metre; and numerous didactic eclogues of the pastoral poets might be cited in which it served for analogue to Latin elegiacs." Benivieni's elegy on the death (1484) of Feo Belcari is given by Symonds both in the original and in translation (*ibid.*, pp. 321, 561). It is probably in this century, indeed, that the term 'elegy' was first availed of for vernacular laments for the dead. Quadrio (cited above, § 5) believed that the earliest use of the term was by Bernardo Bellincioni (1452–1492) in his two poems on the death of Giuliano de' Medici and the Cardinal of Mantova. Jacopo Sannazaro, who carries us over into the next century, and is one of the more original followers of Petrarch, wrote elegies on the Marchese di Pescara, Pietro-Leonio, and the Saviour, and his pastoral romance, the Arcadia (1489–1504), is replete with the love-plaints of disheartened shepherds. — The Roman elegists were imitated by Pontano, Poliziano, Sannazaro, and Lorenzo de' Medici, who showed their enthusiasm for ancient poetry not only by reproduction of the mythologizing, descriptive, idyllic features of the old amatory poetry, but also by doing most of their work in Latin. From popular themes, however, they also appropriated much. For Pontano's address to the personified erotic elegy, see Symonds 2 : 219. — In the next two centuries the decadence of poetry brought with it, as so often is the case, a rise of the elegy in popularity. Three streams must be followed: the revival of erotic Petrarchism (Bembo, Molza, Giovanni Guidiccioni, Vittoria Colonna, Michelangelo, Gaspara Stampa, Tansillo, etc.; see the collection, Lirici del secolo XVI, Milano: 1879, as noted above, VIII, F); the revival of the ancient elegy in tercet form, called capitoli (Ariosto, Alamanni, Chiabrera, Fulvio Testi, etc.); and the Marinism of Marino and his followers. In the sincerity and elevation of his threnodic poetry, Filicaia anticipates the later elegy of sorrow.

— In the eighteenth century the erotic pastoral poetry of the Arcadian Academy must be surveyed (see the poets in Carducci's collection, mentioned above); then, from the middle of the century, the great European movements that broke up the formality of the age — the naturalistic, sentimental, romantic, and revolutionary movements — must be studied in their bearing upon the gradual extinction of the erotic as an elegiac theme and the growth of the elegy of grief or, at least, of melancholy tenderness. Note the parallel development in England, France, and Germany, and pay particular attention to the influence of Thomson, Young, Gray, Hervey, Blair, the Ossianic literature, and Rousseau. Consider, also, the elegiac qualities of Foscolo's Sepolcri (1807), the reply to it by Ippolito Pindemonte, and the sepulchral lucubrations of Bertòla and Alessandro Verri. Other nineteenth-century examples of elegiac verse may be found in the works of Leopardi, Manzoni, Silvio Pellico, Carducci, Giuseppe Chiarini, Arturo Graf, etc. But for the Italian elegy of this century the student must rely upon his own research.

(*d*) *French Elegiac Poetry.*

Potez's monograph, the chief aid, has been mentioned under § 5. The articles in the French encyclopedias, noted at the head of this division on the elegy, are helpful. For the 16th to 18th centuries Quadrio and Blankenburg-Sulzer (cited above, § 5) present much material. Pierre Ladoue's Millevoye (Paris: 1812) is suggestive. For the rest, see the critical apparatus on French poetry from the 14th to 19th centuries, above, VII.

Examining first the erotic and threnodic verse of the troubadours and trouvères (see above, (*a*)), and the continuation of these native themes through the poetic decline of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, we must consider successively the elegiac lyrics of adoration and lament to be found in the Miracles and Mystères, and the twenty-six elegies, in couplets, and the various funeral poems, of Clément Marot (1487–1544). The student may question whether the Marot poems are the product of Italian influence, also whether they may be properly regarded as the first

French poems to receive the name of elegy. It may be noted that the older contemporaries of Marot, Jean Le Maire de Belges, for instance, still called their threnodic verses *plaintes* (as Jean Le Maire's Plainte du Désiré, 1503, in memory of Louis de Luxembourg). On the other hand, the term 'elegy' had been used by Jean Le Maire in his Description du Temple de Vénus (1516), and as early as 1500 in the Chronique de Louis XII by Jean d'Auton. Marot's first elegy was composed in 1523. In 1547 appeared Gilles Dorigny's Le Tuteur d'Amour. In 1551 Bérenger de la Tour published thirteen elegies and a Chant Élégiaque in his Siècle d'Or. Other elegiac poems by Charles Fontaine, Jean de la Péruse, Jean Doublet (who in his Élégies, 1559, tried to establish a definite substitute for the classical distich, but was not followed), Phil. Bugnyon, Cl. Taillemont, Louise Labé, Cl. Turrin, Cl. Pontoux, are mentioned by Blankenburg-Sulzer as published between 1555 and 1569. The development of both threnodic and erotic themes may be traced in these. It may be suggested, also, that here the erotic qualities of the madrigal, especially in Italy and France, should be considered. Next the classicizing influence of the Pléiade must be scrutinized for evidence of the employment of ancient elegies as models. Blankenburg-Sulzer give a list of nineteen writers of elegies between Ronsard (Œuvres, Paris: 1567) and Scévola de St.-Marthe (Œuvres, Poitiers: 1600), including Jean de Baïf, Phil. Desportes (perhaps the chief of Ronsard's elegiac disciples), Mellin de St.-Gelais, Ét. Jodelle, and Amadis Jamyn. Ronsard's love-sonnets betray the influence of Petrarch, — another witness to the predominant position of the Italian lyrist in the erotic verse of modern Europe. In his Imprécation aux bûcherons de la forêt de Gastine, however, the Frenchman produced a composition of quite another sort, which reminds one forcibly of the ancient Greek hortatory elegy. Ronsard expressed his own idea of the elegy in the following lines: "Les vers de l'élégie au premier furent faicts/Pour y chanter des morts les gestes et les faicts/Joints au son du cornet; maintenant on compose/Divers sujets en elle et reçoit toute chose./Amour, pour y régner, en a chassé la mort." In connection with Ronsard and his school, may be considered the elegiac character of a host of little poems on the short-lived beauty of roses, the development of which can be traced back to the De Rosis Nascentibus attributed to Ausonius (*c.* A.D. 310–395; see Teuffel § 421, 2, K, 7). In the early seventeenth century Malherbe's beautiful Consolation à Duperrier, Racan's Consolation à Mgr. de Bellegarde, and the more vivid poems of Théophile de Viau may be noted. After Malherbe the elegy assumes a note of impersonality. In the last part of the seventeenth century it falls with other forms of poetry under the sway of Boileau, who in his L'Art Poétique (ll. 38–57. 1673) notices both the threnodic and the erotic strains of the elegy, and inveighs against the lack of sincerity in the erotic elegy of the French. What poems had Boileau in mind? How many poems actually bore the name of elegy at this time? Blankenburg-Sulzer refer to eleven or twelve writers of elegies in the seventeenth century. Did Boileau derive his knowledge of the elegy from classical sources only? See, in addition to those already mentioned, the elegies of Mme. de la Souze and Jean Hénault, and La Fontaine's elegy to Fouquet, the Nymphes de Vaux, sometimes referred to as the one genuine elegy from Malherbe to the end of the eighteenth century. Proceeding to the eighteenth century we have the welcome aid of Potez's monograph (see above, § 5), the first chapter of which treats of the origin of French elegiac poetry in the eighteenth century (Chaulieu, Voltaire, Bernis, Dorat, Gentil-Bernard, Le Tourneur, Huber, Colardeau, Feutry, Gilbert, Saint-Lambert, Mancini-Nivernais (cf. above, § 3, IV, D), Baculard d'Arnaud, etc. This should be supplemented with the references in Blankenburg-Sulzer). The influence, melancholy in character, of English poets (Pope, Young, James Hervey, Blair, Thomson) and of the Ossianic literature, and the sentimental effect of German poets (Gessner, Wieland, Kleist, Karsch, Cronegk, Dusch), are apparent in the second part of the century. It should be noted that Potez asserts that before the eighteenth century the elegy scarcely existed as a type in French literature, that before the Revolution it was prevailingly gallant, and that afterwards it was mostly threnodic. Important references bearing upon the gradual change in opinion by which the elegy was narrowed to the sentimental, *la tendresse*, and then to the threnodic, are given by Potez, pp. 73–74. In this connection the decline of the influence of Ovid and the rise of that of Tibullus and Propertius are worthy of attention (cf. Potez, 84–85). Discussing the elegy of the close of this century and of the first quarter of the next, Potez considers Parny, Bertin, Dequerle, Ginguené, Lebrun-Pindare, Chevalier de Bonnard, Léonard, André Chénier (especially important; see his Jeune Captive, and his Greek elegies), Duault, Tissot, Mollevaut, Labouisse, Fontanes, Legouvé, Charles Nodier, Marie-Joseph Chénier, Gorsse, Joseph Treneuil, Casimir Delavigne, Edmond Géraud, Soumet, Charles Loyson, Mmes. Dufrénoy, Babois, Desroches, de Vannoz, Desbordes-Valmore, and Millevoye (cf. above, § 3, IV, E), etc. Typical of the elegies written by most of these is the amatory poetry of Parny, Chênedollé, and Millevoye. Compare the earlier English attempts at the same thing by James Hammond (1716–1742). Can any relation between the English and French attempts be demonstrated? With Lamartine (1791–1869) the elegy experiences a revival and is distinguished by *tendresse* and sentimental melancholy. His Le Lac is as famous in French poetry as Gray's elegy in English. Consider, also, the elegiac melancholy of the Paysage dans le Golfe de Gênes, Le Premier Regret, and the Méditations. Indeed, from this poetry of romantic sensibility proceeds what may be called the romantic elegy (*élégie intime*), of which some of Béranger's songs or meditations furnish charming examples. During the rest of the century, this and other notes — erotic, epicurean, religious, classicist, contemporary political and patriotic, and exotic-oriental — in manner and subject call for consideration. Victor Hugo (Feuilles d'Automne, etc.), Musset, Vigny (Elva), Théophile Gautier, and Hégésippe Moreau may be selected for special study. The elegiac note will, however, be found to recur in very many nineteenth-century poets. The sentimental verse of Mme. Desbordes-Valmore, Sully Prudhomme, François Coppée, Eugène Manuel, and

Paul Verlaine is not seldom elegiac. Baudelaire has been called an "élégiaque macabre," and Leconte de Lisle an "élégiaque nihiliste."

(*e*) *English Elegiac Poetry.*

Since the national genius has constantly urged almost every lyrist to expatiate upon death, and since most of those who have evaded this urgency have fallen into the erotic melancholy either seriously or playfully, the body of verse to be examined is very large. Unfortunately there are no trustworthy compendious aids. Mary Lloyd's History of the Elegy (Introd. to her Elegies: Ancient and Modern), comparatively full in its treatment of the English elegy, is far from exhaustive; and the arrangement of materials is somewhat confusing. The most available guide by reason of its clear-cut divisions into chapters and its extensive bibliographies is the Cambridge History of English Literature.

The melancholy strain has always been so notable in English poetry that there is little wonder that in English usage since the beginning of the sixteenth century the term 'elegy' has come to be restricted to funeral song or lament. The elegiacal predisposition of the Anglo-Saxon genius is one of the truisms of literary history (see, e.g., ten Brink on Deor's Lament, in Hist. Eng. Lit., trans. Kennedy, 1: 61. 1889). Not only may it be traced in Old English epical literature, both 'national' and Christian, but it dominates practically all the remains of the earlier 'national' lyric (Deor's Lament, Wanderer, Seafarer, Wife's Complaint, Husband's Message, Ruin) and contributes a definite tone to the later Christian lyric and lyrical epic (Death Song, Riming Poem, Dream of the Rood, Address of the Soul to the Body, etc.). The erotic note also appears, as in the Husband's Message. What further examples of amatory verse may have existed we can only conjecture. But it is probably safe to conclude that the Old English lyric, both national and Christian, was characterized by melancholy contemplation rather than by light, or erotic, sentiment. Have we in such probability an illustration of the influence of climate and of physical environment? Can any similar preponderance be detected in the earliest vernacular poetry of other northern peoples (Germans, Danes, Russians, Poles, Swedes, Norwegians, Icelanders, Esquimaux)? Compare the early Celtic elegies (by Llywarch Hen, whose "Heroic Elegies, etc." were edited by W. Owen, Lond.: 1792; by Gwalchmai, Gruffydd ab yr Yuad Côch, and many others; see the notes on the Celtic lyric, above).

In the transition period (1150–1250) one may note the elegiac strains in reflective and didactic poetry, beginning with the Poema Morale; the secular love strain of the Owl and the Nightingale; the erotic mysticism of the Luve Ron and of poems addressed to the Virgin. See the poems described in Camb. Hist. Eng. Lit., vol. I, Chap. XI. In the fourteenth century the Pearl adds the note of personal bereavement, but Chaucer and his English and Scottish followers in this and the next century develop the secular erotic themes associated with the troubadour and court-of-love poetry of the Continent. The threnodic as well as the amatory is also found in the popular ballads and lyrics, both Scottish and English, of the time. The secular lyric of love, such as Alisoun or the Spring Song, and the religious love lyric, such as Love-Longing, vary from spontaneous gladness to real or affected melancholy. — Special attention should be given to the poems that are grouped in the manuscripts under the head 'Complaints,' of which the Quia Amore Langueo and the Filius Regis Mortuus Est are the best examples. — See the lyrics of the Harleian, Vernon, and Hill manuscripts; vols. 15, 24, 26, 49, 124 of the Early English Text Society's publications, and vol. 101 of the Extra Series; and Camb. Hist. Eng. Lit., I, Chap. XVII. Does the erotic essentially countervail the threnodic in the art poetry of the Chaucerians? Can any connection, in form or spirit, be shown between the development of erotic and threnodic lyric themes?

Scattered through the miracle plays of the later thirteenth, the fourteenth, and the early fifteenth century will be found religious passages of the threnodic type; some also of adoration of the Virgin.

Skelton (1460?–1529) furnishes us not only with the genuine lament for the dead, but also with the famous, whimsical elegy for Philip Sparrow, the pet bird of one Joan Scrope. The latter poem belongs to a trivial but interesting sub-type of the elegy. A brief allusion to several such laments, ancient and modern, for pet animals, may be found in Mary Lloyd's Elegies: Ancient and Modern, pp. 44–49. — With Skelton we are well on the way toward Elizabethan elegy; and now the task of selection grows complex and increasingly difficult. On the one hand we have amatory poets who engage in "such furnace-like sighing, such piteous pleading, such grievous complaints" that one is tempted to find therein some vital connection between erotic and threnodic complaints, some justification (if only superficial) of the application of the one term 'elegy' to both themes. The erotic strain finds expression for the most part in the Elizabethan sonnet (Wyatt, Surrey, Gascoigne, Sidney, Spenser, Shakespeare, Daniel, Constable, etc., etc.), but it assumes also other forms, as in Sidney's exquisite Dirge for Love and Spenser's marriage poems. Such love poetry varies in its spirit from the sincere, the poignant, and intensely passionate to the tender, the whimsical, and jesting. On the other hand we have, during this period, the writers of genuine threnodics, — 'complaints,' 'laments,' 'elegies' for the illustrious or beloved dead. In most of the collected works of the poets not only of the Elizabethan but also of the early Stuart period may be found dirges or elegies sacred to the memory of this or that friend or patron: they seem to have been written on any kind of provocation, public or private. The student should note: (1) the various *complaints* (such as Gascoigne's Complaint of Philomen 1562–76, Spenser's Ruins of Time 1591, or the complaints in Shakespeare's Venus and Adonis and his Lucrece), some addressed to the memory of the dead, some to the necessity that rules the individual, others evoked by general fatalities, such as the fall of a city, and still others (to quote Spenser's words) merely "small poems of the world's vanity," sometimes even narrative or allegorical in manner (cf. Spenser's Muiopotmos); (2) more formal *memorial poems*, eventually appropriating the name of elegy, such as Surrey's on Wyatt, Spenser's Daphnaida, Jonson's on Shakespeare, several by Drummond of Hawthornden, a vast number in honor of Sidney (cf. the later collection in memory of Prince Henry, son of James I), etc.; (3) poems called *epitaphs*, some of them short and epigrammatic in form, others so long and reflective as to constitute memorial elegies (e.g., the epitaphs composed by Ben Jonson); (4) *dirges*, such as Fletcher's 'mourning' of Aspatia (Maid's Tragedy, II, 2); and (5) *melancholy-reflective poems*, such as the verses attributed to Beaumont, On the Tombs in Westminster Abbey. These are by no means mutually exclusive classes: the Tombs in Westminster would perhaps have been called a complaint by Spenser, and the memorial poems are called indifferently complaints, epitaphs, elegies, and even eclogues. But this lack of agreement in matter of terms necessitates all the more careful study of content and kind in their bearing upon the growth of elegy proper. It is for the student to determine when the more inclusive denomination was first employed, and in what relation it eventually stood to such poems as have just been indicated.

The amatory verse of the seventeenth century develops, in general, the less charming aspects of the theme (compare the eroticism of Alexandria, of Rome during the Empire, and of similar stages in European literature as already noted). The character of the threnodic poems of the earlier part of this century has been sufficiently indicated in the last paragraph. In the late seventeenth and through the eighteenth century the elegy grows more formal and develops to an extreme the over-elaborate pastoral strain that had been gaining in prominence from Elizabethan times on. These strictures do not, however, apply to the two most important elegies of the period, Lycidas and the Elegy in a Country Churchyard. The second gave rise to many imitations and was translated into Greek, Latin, Italian, French, German, etc. The study of its influence is a topic by itself.

For the growing, and ultimately common, adoption of the term 'elegy,' and its constant restriction to the poem addressed to the dead, in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, the works of the following authors, to mention only a few of the better known, should be scrutinized: Donne, Drayton, Sir John Beaumont, Quarles, Cowley (on the death of Crashaw), Henry King (Poems, Elegies, Paradoxes and Sonnets, Lond.: 1657; his Deep Groan, etc. — published in 1649; Works, ed. J. Hannah, 1843), John Oldham, Denham (on Cowley, etc.), Dryden, William Walsh, Nahum Tate, John Gay, Elizabeth Rowe, Tickell (on Addison), Pope (on the Unfortunate Lady), Shenstone, Robert Blair (The Grave), William Mason, J. Ogilvie, James Beattie, W. L. Bowles, etc. For a long list of minor eighteenth-century elegists, see Blankenburg-Sulzer (Art. Elegie, 1: 472–476. 1796). The elegiac character of Young's Night-Thoughts (see especially Book III) should be appraised, particularly in view of its effect upon continental poetry; see also J. Hervey's Meditations and Contemplations. For an eighteenth-century attempt to revive the classical amatory elegy, see the Love Elegies of James Hammond (1716–1742), which had several imitators, — some of them mentioned in Blankenburg. The only successful revival of the Tibullian-Propertian elegy, however, occurred, as already noted, in France. Much other threnodic (and erotic) lyric material is to be found also in the drama of the periods passed in review.

In the nineteenth century elegiac verse is threnodic, serious, and of noble poetic inspiration. Burns, slightly earlier, but of the spirit of this century, Byron, Shelley, Tennyson, Matthew Arnold, Rossetti, Swinburne, Watson — to mention only a few of those who have attained mastery of the type — treat their subjects with a depth, poignancy, mystic spirituality, and unaffected sublimity that indicate the high-water mark of elegiac lament in English literature, — a literature that perhaps more than any other has displayed a natural bent for the poetry of mourning. Shelley's Adonais, in memory of Keats, and Swinburne's Ave atque Vale, in memory of Baudelaire, must always stand with Milton's Lycidas as among the best examples of the imaginative memorial elegy, and to these may be added Tennyson's In Memoriam both as an imaginative unit and as a *series* of independently interpretative elegiac poems. Only second to these in English literature are

Matthew Arnold's Thyrsis, commemorative of Clough, and his Rugby Chapel, in memory of his father, Dr. Thomas Arnold. Swinburne and Arnold are particularly rich in the variety as well as the spirit of their elegiac poems. For brief notices of other elegiac writers of this century see Miss Lloyd's book, already cited. The elegiac poetry of love is less in quantity in this century, but it is prevailingly sincere and noble. *Vers de société* of the mock-melancholy style, of course, calls for some attention, but it is rarely to be regarded as falling under elegy proper.

(*f*) *German Elegiac Poetry.*

For apparatus see above, XIII. A. Kostlivy's Die Anfänge der deutschen antikisierenden Elegie, etc. (Progr. Eger: 1898), and the section on elegy in Wackernagel's Poetik, Rhetorik und Stilistik are helpful; but the student will find that he must himself work out the list of elegiac poets and poems from the collections of German poetry. On the imitation of Ovid's Heroides see G. Ernst, Die Heroide in der deutschen Lit. (Heidelberg: 1901).

What may have been the laments of love and death that doubtless were sung by the pagan German tribes we can only conjecture (see above, XIII, A). The remains of Old High German poetry (A.D. 750–1050) are barren of elegiac material except for the Liebesgruss in the Ruodlieb (*c.* 1030; see above, XIII, B) and some elegiac notes in the epical literature of the age (see below, § 12). With Middle High German poetry (1050–1350) we must note, in passing, the Annolied (*c.* 1080), reminiscent of the late Latin eulogistic elegy noted above, and the erotic theme in lyrics addressed to the Virgin. But here the important fields for observation are those of the National epic, the Court epic, and the Minnesang. The threnodic and erotic passages in the first two (see below, § 12) should be collected and compared with a view to determining the characteristic differentiations in elegiac strain, and the relation, if any, between the National and Court epic-elegiac strain and that of the Old High German Liebesgruss, etc., and of other early epic and ballad poetry. Of particular importance in the National epic is the Klage of the Nibelungenlied (*c.* 1200), which contains the lament for the heroes slain in the great battle of the Burgundians, Huns, and others; and in the Court epics the idealization of love (*Minne*), which brings us once again into the region of romantic, chivalric woman-worship. In the third and most important field, that of the Minnesang, this romantic cult finds its lyric expression, partly indigenous, partly under French and Provençal influence (compare above, VII, A–D). In the works of the Minnesingers (references above, XIII, C) songs of courtly and of humble love, patriotic and eulogistic verse, and threnodic poems (see especially Reinmar von Hagenau) are to be found in plenty. All these varieties receive their fullest expression in the work of the greatest of these lyrists, Walther von der Vogelweide (*c.* 1170–*c.* 1230). In the thirteenth century the song of lowly love (*niedere Minne*) becomes particularly important (Neidhart von Reuenthal and others), while the influence of Walther von der Vogelweide continues to the end of the period and on into the Meistergesang of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries.

Proceeding to the Early New High German period (1350–1740) the student must search for amatory and threnodic themes in the complicated and artificial verse of the Meistersingers, in the great outburst during the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries of simple and spontaneous Volkslieder, in the mystical literature of the same centuries, and in the religious poetry surrounding the Reformation. He must then trace the development of these themes in the corresponding popular and religious poetry of the seventeenth century up to the Latin Renaissance. Then arises that question the vital importance of which we have already noticed in earlier periods of other European literatures: to what extent do the native themes pass under the classical (in this case, French and pseudo-classical) influence and become colored thereby, or to what extent is the elegiac poetry of the new age a revival rather of the ancient classical form? What relation to these questions have the poems of Weckherlin (1584–1653)? He does not use the term 'elegy.' Opitz (1597–1639), however, does, both in his poems and his poetics. Whether Opitz was the first German poet to adopt this term, and what relation his elegiac verse bears to anterior German elegiac themes on the one hand and to the classical elegy on the other, are questions for consideration. The inquiry should of course take account of such of his poems as are elegiac in theme though not in name. See the work of Kostlivy, mentioned above. To what extent did the literary societies (see above, XIII, D) affect the elegy? See especially the work of Simon Dach (1605–1659); also Paul Fleming's (1609–1640) elegy on the Fatherland, André Tscherning's poem on the coming of summer (1655), and several sonnets of Gryphius (1616–1664) composed in sorrowful strain. The study of the German Renaissance elegy must be prosecuted through the debased euphuistic, or Second Silesian, school of Lohenstein and Hofmannswaldau, and through the 'court poets' who opposed the euphuistic group (see especially the fresh and charming amatory poetry of Günther, 1695–1723), and eventually under the leadership of Gottsched (1700–1766), the German Boileau, brought the Renaissance to its close.

Next must be considered the elegiac verse of the Swiss school of Bodmer and Breitinger, of the quondam disciples of Gottsched (see Bremer *Beiträge*), of Klopstock and his followers, and of the Göttinger Bund, which prolonged the influence of Klopstock. Bodmer himself wrote elegies, as did also Haller, E. von Kleist, and J. A. Cramer; also A. Kästner, the Gottschedian, and Gleim, the Anacreontic. Klopstock, however, was the dominating figure of the new poetry. The Germanic melancholy of the eighteenth century colors not only a considerable part of his patriotic and religious verse and of his imitation of antiquity, but also several of the poems definitely conceived and executed as elegies. Various members of the Göttinger Bund wrote elegies, — F. W. Gotter, J. H. Voss, and J. M. Miller; but most notably Hölty, who contracted the contagious Klopstockian melancholy and handed it on more or less directly to Matthisson, Salis, Tiedge, Kosegarten, and Hölderlin. The elegiac effect of Ossian (see, e.g., Kretschmann's lament of Rhingulf for the death of Arminius) and of the English melancholic sepulchral poets (see von Creuz' Die Gräber and poems by F. W. Zachariae) has been suggested above (XIII, E). With the classical period of Goethe and Schiller — the Römische Elegien and Euphrosyne of the former, and the Spaziergang and Pompeii of the latter — we come to the close of the eighteenth century, to the culmination of classical elegy in Germany. Wackernagel believes the Spaziergang is the greatest masterpiece of all elegiac poetry (Poetik, etc., 176. 1906). A modest claim! For a follower of Goethe in this form, see Knebel. — Further examples of elegiac writing during this century may be found in the various poetical journals and collections of the period, such as the Göttinger, the Vossischer, and the Leipziger Musenalmanach, the Horen, Schiller's Musenalmanach, etc. Blankenburg-Sulzer (cited above, § 5) give a long list of the elegies of this century under the article *Elegie*, but the list must be used with caution. They mention also a collection, Elegieen der Deutschen (Lemgo: 1776), which contains poems by Gleim, Klopstock, Wieland, Kleist, Ramler, Haller, Karschinn, Jacobi, Müller, Uz, Hahn, Gotter, Blum, Hölty, Opitz, W. Heinse, and Bodmer. The collection was made by K. E. K. Schmidt. Satisfactory materials can, however, be obtained only by first-hand selection from the lyrical and reflective poems with which the age is replete.

Turning to the nineteenth century the student will note the continued restriction of the term 'elegy' to sorrowful subjects, and the widening of the metrical field to include new varieties of verse. Romanticism, upon the affinity of which for the elegy we have remarked, must be followed through its decline in this century and the student will listen for the melancholy note. The contribution of new movements of the spirit, as they affect the elegy, must be taken into account. 'Young Germany,' the pessimistic, naturalistic, mystical, and symbolistic movements all colored the course of the elegy. Among the German and Austrian poets of the century who wrote elegies or whose works were elegiac in tendency, were the following: A. W. Schlegel, Rückert, Hölderlin, Immermann, Heine, Lenau, 'A. Grün' (Graf von Auersperg), J. C. F. von Zedlitz, Geibel, Herwegh, Storm, F. von Saar, etc.

(*g*) *Elegiac Poetry of Other European Nations.* The rise of amatory and threnodic themes in other literatures, and their relation to the revival of the classical elegy, may be traced by means of the apparatus given above for the general study of the lyric. In Portuguese poetry, always distinguished for its lyric tendency, much material will be found. The treatment of love and death may be studied first in the *Romanceiros*; then, in the rich field of the *Cancioneiros*, which, with its Provençal court poetry, will supply the usual troubadour material. Italian renaissance influence appears with Sá de Miranda (1495–1558), who, in elegiac composition, was followed by Antonio Ferreira, Andrade Caminha, Diego Bernardes, Rodriguez Lobo, etc. But it was Camoens (*c.* 1524–1580) who most of all contributed to the actual culmination of the sub-type in Portugal. — In Spanish literature the rise of erotic and threnodic poetry may be traced much as in the other European literatures. Beginning with an examination of the early heroic poetry, the student will pass to the *Romanceros*, and then to the lyric proper of the fifteenth century (the *Cancioneros*). The latter, an artificial court poetry with plaints of love and death after the manner of the Provençal troubadours, whose influence had passed into Castile by way of Portugal and Catalonia, deserves especial attention. In the 16th and 17th centuries the lyric note is predominantly Petrarchian, and the study of the Spanish elegy must, therefore, direct itself in large degree to the imitations of the Italian terzina, e.g., the elegies of Juan Boscan, of Garcilaso de la Vega and even of the great Lope, of Diego Hurtado de Mendoza, Hernando de Acuña, Juan de la Cueva, Fernando de Herrera, Juan de Castellanos (whose endless so-called elegies on the famous discoverers and conquerors of America are more epical than elegiac), Vicente Espinel, Quevedo, and of numerous Castilians, some of whom are mentioned by Blankenburg-Sulzer (*op. cit.*). Passing over the lyric decadence of the 18th century, the student will next be concerned with the imitations of French poets of the 19th century and with the original elegiacs of Vicente Querol, Federico Balart, and many others.

(*h*) *Oriental Elegiac Poetry.*

For apparatus see above, XXII–XXXII.

In oriental poetry, especially of the Hebrews, Hindoos, Persians, and Arabs, the student will find uncounted treasure of plaintive verse, amatory and obituary. A treatise on the whole subject of oriental elegiac verse by a properly equipped scholar is much to be desired. If choice of theme, however, — love or death, — is to be made, the preference should be given to the latter, for at least in scattered essays the poetry of the erotic has already received various and, in some of its features, fairly adequate treatment (compare above, XXII–XXXII). The prevalence of lamentation as a popular custom among many oriental races suggests special inquiry into the relation of the non-literary to the literary in compositions of this kind. The subject is admirably adapted to treatment in a monograph. See the articles Lamentation, Mourning Customs, in the Encyclopaedia Biblica, and the references appended to each. The field of inquiry could of course be widely extended by reference to more general anthropological and ethnological materials. The student will, however, first, and more naturally, devote his attention to the aesthetic qualities of oriental elegy — its poetic fervor and intensity, and the fitness, as well as history, of its rhythmical forms. Where indeed can more dignified and yet piercingly poignant threnodies be found than in the Book of Lamentations, in portions of Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and Isaiah, and in some of the Psalms? Of particular interest in Hebrew poetry of this type are the passages cast in 'limping verse,' which gradually became identified with elegiac lament. See the section on Lamentations in S. R. Driver's Introd. to Lit. of the Old Testament; A. S. Cook, The Art of Poetry (Boston: 1892), pp. 230–232; K. Budde, Das hebräische Klagelied, in *Zeitschr. f. die Alttest. Wissenschaft* 2: 1 ff., 3: 299 ff., 11: 234 ff., 12: 31 ff., 261 ff., and *Preussische Jahrbücher* 73: 461 ff.; and the Encyclopaedia Biblica and Encyclopaedia Britannica articles upon the Old Testament books mentioned above, where further bibliography will be found, and many suggestions of subjects for research. Budde's series of articles just cited gives references to the various Old Testament passages written in the Hebrew elegiac measure, and the article Lamentation in the Encyc. Biblica furnishes a convenient list of elegiac specimens in the limping verse and in other measures. For the broadening of aesthetic judgment and of comparative view, the remaining literatures of the Orient furnish materials of incalculable value. What simple yet elevated sorrow in the dirge of Gilgamesh over the dead hero Eabani, in the twelfth tablet of the Babylonian epic of Gilgamesh (see above, XXVIII)! What, in the way of love lament, sweeter or more pensive than Kalidasa's Cloud Messenger or passages in the Sakuntala! What more flowered with loveliness, mystic or sensuous, but always graceful, than the songs of Saadi, Hafiz, Jami, and a host of others (see Encyc. Brit., Art. Persia: Language and Literature)! These are the merest fragments of suggestions for long but delightful study; for more definite, though still fragmentary, notices see Vischer, Aesthetik, § 894; K. Rosenkranz, Die Poesie und ihre Geschichte (Königsberg: 1855), pp. 84–86, 387 ff.; Carriere, Die Kunst im Zusammenhang der Kulturentwickelung, etc., vol. I.

B. *The Epigram.*[1]

1. *The Greek and Roman Epigram.*

The most satisfactory account of the ancient epigram is R. Reitzenstein's article Epigramm in Pauly-Wissowa's Realencyclopädie (1907). For further notices of the Greek epigram see Flach (cited above, § 5), P. Masqueray's Bibliog. pratique de la litt. grecque (p. 244), and the histories of Greek literature, especially those by Christ, K. O.

---

[1] The following notes on Epigram, Ode, Sonnet, and Song have been made exceedingly brief because of lack of space. But the national and historical divisions and the references in the present section under I–XXXIII and under XXXIV, A, The Elegy, apply more or less to all the sub-types of the lyric; and the discussions under Theory and Technique of the Lyric, § I, IV, A, B, C, D, H, will indicate problems that call for historical solution. The historical and bibliographical materials here supplied may enable the student to find his way through the literature of a few sub-types other than the Elegy.

Müller, Croiset, Bergk, Bernhardy, Susemihl (G. Knaack in Susemihl's Gesch. d. gr. Lit. in der Alexandrinerzeit, II, Chap. XXVI), Couat; Wilamowitz-Moellendorff (in Hinneberg's Kult. d. Gegenwart, T. I, Abt. VIII, 29, 95, 213. 3d ed. 1912); also Reitzenstein's Epigramm und Skolion (1893), for the Alexandrian period; Symonds' Studies of the Greek Poets; Mackail's Select Epigrams from the Greek Anthology (Introduction); J. Davies' essay on Epigrams in *Quart. Rev.*, 117; F. A. Gragg's Study of the Greek Epigram before 300 B.C. (in *Proceedings, American Acad. of Arts and Sciences* 46: 3. 1912); and Garnett's article Anthology in the Encyc. Brit. Editions, translations, and imitations of the Anthology are cited by Garnett, and above, I, The Greek Lyric; see also Blankenburg-Sulzer, Art. *Sinngedicht.* For further notices of the Roman epigram see S. Piazza (noted above, § 5); the histories, especially those of Schanz and Teuffel; and the references cited by Blankenburg-Sulzer; also Hillscher in *Jahrb. f. Phil., Suppl.* 18: 353. The collections of Latin epigrams, by Burmann and by Riese-Bücheler, are noted in Garnett's article. Sellar's Martial in the Encyc. Brit. will orient the student in the study of Martial. See further F. B. R. Hellems, The Epigram and its Greatest Master, Martial (*Univ. of Colorado, Studies* 4: 5–16. 1906); H. Poeschel, Typen aus der Anthologia Palatina und der Epigrammen Martials (Diss., München: 1905), showing Martial's imitation of satiric types in the anthology, and contending that Martial is not personal — perhaps not even realistic — in his satire; P. G. von Spiegel, Zur Charakteristik des Epigrammatiker M. V. Martialis (Progr., Innsbruck: 1891), interpreting the epigrams of Martial as an expression of the poet's personality and times. — For the Latin Christian epigram see Ebert (cited above, § 5), I, 127, 129, 434, 435, 526, 603; II, 28, 83, 161; III, 343, 358; *et passim*; the histories of Manitius cited above, § 5; T. Wright, Anglo-Latin Satirical Poets and Epigrammatists of the 12th Century (Rolls Series. 2 vols. Lond.: 1872); L. B. Hessler, The Latin Epigrams of the Middle English Period (Menasha, Wisconsin: 1916).

The epigram may be traced through all literatures, ancient and modern, occidental and oriental. It is one of the most various and most prolific of types (see above, § 1, IV, H, Epigram), if true type it is. Its history has not as yet been traced with systematic thoroughness, and therefore generalizations as to its character and development are premature. Of the Greek epigram we have a most unusual and immensely rich collection — the

Greek Anthology — extending from the sixth century before Christ to the fourteenth after. And the amazing history here revealed is of entrancing interest, especially if one adopt the theory of Wilamowitz-Moellendorff: that in germinating power, fullness, and literary capability, the epigram as cultivated by the Greeks is nothing more or less than what we call Lyric Poetry, capable of recording any personal experience, whether of grief — as in the monumental inscription — or of intensely individual love, or reflective emotion, or of scorn — as in the pungency of satire. From the epigram, of which he styles Callimachus "the most perfect master," W.-M. derives the sonnet of Shakespeare and much that is most vivid and artistic in Goethe. From the epigram he derives the elegiac love poetry of the Alexandrians, the hendecasyllabics of Catullus, the love poetry of Propertius and Ovid (see Die griech. Lit. d. Altertums, in Hinneberg's Kultur d. Gegenwart as above, C, Hellenistische Periode, III Poesie). In the Greek Anthology one finds, and may subject to comparative review, the simple, dignified, marble-pure inscriptions of the Hellenic period (700–480 B.C.), and of the Attic (480–320) with Simonides of Ceos as its glory; here, too, the varied, fanciful, and highly ingenious epigram — votive, elegiac, anecdotic, satirical, erotic, etc. — of the Hellenistic or Alexandrian period (320–140), whose best writers were Leonidas of Tarentum and Callimachus; the epigram of the Greco-Roman period (140 B.C.–A.D. 529), rich with the erotic, oriental fervor of Meleager of Gadara and his followers, or the satirical vein of Nero's Lucillius, and later of Lucian and Palladas; then, the imitative, ingenious, and ornate remains of the great outburst of Byzantine epigram in the age of Justinian; and the debased copyings of later ages.

Turning to literature in the Latin language, we find remains infinitely less rich. To the period before the Golden Age belong the simple epitaphs of Naevius and Pacuvius, three similar epigrams by Ennius, and the slightly more polished fragments of Lutatius Catulus, Licinus, and Aedituus. Later, in place of the charming grace and crystal purity of much in the Greek Anthology, we find the obscene, scurrilous, satirical, servile, or frigid, and only here and there a truly beautiful production. In the Golden Age (63–14 B.C.) Catullus writes epigrams of merit but without the beauty of his other work. Of the Roman epigrammatists Martial, of the Flavian Age (A.D. 69–96), was head and front, and his influence upon the subsequent development of the epigram is paramount. After his time only Ausonius, of the fourth century, produced epigrams that are really worth studying. The contribution of the Romans to the sub-type is essentially in the satirical vein, and from them has been derived the modern view that associates the epigrammatic with the satirical.

2. *The Modern Epigram.*

Tracing the history of this poetic form in modern national literatures the student should turn first to the immensely helpful lists of epigrammatists in Blankenburg-Sulzer, which run from the middle of the 16th century to nearly the end of the 18th. Next, the general histories must be brought under contribution: see the Appendix for these. On the English epigram see Professor Schelling's Eng. Lit. in the Lifetime of Shakespeare, pp. 326–331; G. Waterhouse, The Lit. Relations of England and Germany in the 17th Century (Cambridge: 1914), Chap. V; E. Urban, Owenus (i.e. John Owen) und die deutschen Epigrammatiker des 18. Jahrh. (see above, § 5); B. Patzak, F. Hebbels Epigramme (in *Forsch. z. neueren Littgesch.*, No. 19. 1902); W. D. Adams, Introd. to his English Epigrams (Lond.: 1878), — popular; H. P. Dodd, Introd. to his The Epigrammatists (2d ed. Lond.: 1875), — also popular. — R. Levy's Martial und die deutsche Epigrammatik des 17. Jahrh. (Diss. Heidelberg. Stuttgart: 1903) is a clear and interesting comparative study, with a helpful bibliographical introduction. On Wernicke see R. Pechel as noted above, § 2. For a study of oriental examples see B. H. Chamberlain, Basho and the Japanese Poetical Epigram (*Trans. Asiatic Soc. of Japan*, vol. 30. 1902); cf. Moulton, Mod. Study of Lit., pp. 213–215.

The Latinists of the Renaissance were prolific of epigrams, and the work of such men as Balbus, Conr. Celtes, Pontanus, Bembo, Scaliger, Stroza, Sannazaro, Melanchthon, Euricius Cordus (biography, edition of text, etc. by K. Krause), the two Bellays, Buchanan, More, and John Owen may be traced in the respective histories of national literatures. A long list of them is given by Blankenburg-Sulzer (3 : 177–180). After examining these the student should inquire to what extent vernacular poems of an epigrammatic character preceded Renaissance vernacular poems actually labeled as epigrams. For this purpose he must consider the terse Provençal poems in quatrains, sixains, etc., the political *Sprüche* of the Minnegesang and Meistergesang, etc. The study of the relation of them to the epigram as such is parallel to the study of the relation of the Provençal songs of love and death to the Renaissance elegy, as noted above (see A, 6, (*a*)). In connection with this inquiry it becomes necessary, of course, to decide when in each vernacular the term epigram was introduced and when it was first used as the designation of a poem. — After scrutinizing the interrelation of these three strands — the Renaissance Latin epigram, the early vernacular poem that is epigrammatic in character but not in name, and the duly labeled vernacular epigram — the student may proceed to determine by further research successive variations of the type in respect both of form and content. Of the modern European nations the French have displayed the greatest cleverness in the epigram, and the Italians, perhaps, the least. Marot and Mellin de St.-Gelais were the pioneers of the French epigram as such. Other French writers of epigrams are de Cailly, Pons de Verdun, Boileau, J.-B. Rousseau, P. D. É. Lebrun, Voltaire, Marmontel, Piron, Rulhière, and M.-J. Chénier. — The English epigram of the Elizabethan Age, Professor S. M. Tucker has said, "was the resultant of two distinct influences : the English epigrams of John Heywood, which were general, didactic, and impersonal, and the Latin epigrams of Martial, which were particular, personal, sometimes satirical, sometimes eulogistic, but almost always occasional. These two influences appear chiefly in the epigrams of Sir John Harington, but they are also to be found in the work of Davies, Bastard, Weever, and a score of other epigrammatists [including the Latin epigrams of John Owen ?] of the Elizabethan and the Jacobean Age." No one, unless it be Pope, and in these later days William Watson, has actually distinguished himself among the English as a writer of epigrams, but the student may find epigrammatic poems among the works of the following, to mention only a few: Robert Crowley, Henry Parrot, Spenser, Ben Jonson (Underwoods), Herrick, Cowley, Waller, Dryden, Prior, Parnell, Swift, Addison, Johnson, Goldsmith, and Young (list from Encyc. Brit.). — The Germans have shown a great love for the epigram, especially for the didactic variety (*Sinngedicht*). Friedrich von Logau (1604–1655), with his three thousand epigrams, is typical of this interest, and is himself "an epigrammatist of first rank." No other modern literature possesses a Logau. Among other German writers of epigrams are Conrad Celtes (in Latin), Weckherlin, Opitz, Tscherning, Gryphius, Wernicke, Kleist, Gleim, Hagedorn, Klopstock, A. W. Schlegel, Lessing, Herder, Goethe, Schiller, Kästner, Haug, Hebbel. Also should be considered the epigrammatic character of the *Priamel* — a brief, sententious form much in favor from the 12th to the 15th century — of which Rosenplüt (15th cent.) was master (see K. Euling, Das Priamel bis Hans Rosenplüt, Studien zur Volkspoesie, in *German. Abhand.*, No. 25. 1905). See, further, Encyc. Brit.

C. *The Ode.*

Consult the general histories and the monographs on national lyric literatures as already noted. Blankenburg-Sulzer and Quadrio give long lists of writers of odes, ancient and modern, coming down, in Blankenburg, to the close of the 18th century. See also the references given above, § 1, IV, C, The Ode, and § 3 *passim* (especially IV, B, C, D).

In following the history of the ode the student should cover the historical divisions indicated above in the outline of the history of the elegy. He will be concerned largely in tracing the development of the more impersonal choral ode (Doric-Pindaric) and of the more personal, subjective (Lesbian-Aeolic-Sapphic) in Greece, the Lesbian-Horatian in Rome, and the influence of Pindar on the one hand and of Horace on the other upon the modern ode.

Of *particular forms or stages* of the ode the following are the most important. (1) The Dorian choral ode (Alcman, Stesichorus, Ibycus, Simonides of Ceos, Pindar, Bacchylides), which was occasional in character, as, for instance, that of Pindar celebrating victories in the Panhellenic Games. From such supreme festivals, indeed, with their communal excitement and significance, was derived much of the elevated measure, sublime thought, and highly imaginative interpretation of fact that have been the inheritance of the sub-type. Without, however, the soaring genius of Pindar, perfectly adapted to such themes, and the unity in variety of his strophe, antistrophe, and epode, the inheritance would have been far less rich. The emphasis placed upon the objective and social occasion in these poems renders them somewhat epical in subject, though they are lyric in their enthusiastic treatment of the theme. Hence some critics have regarded the Dorian occasional ode as a transitional type falling between the epic and pure lyric (Wackernagel). The Homeric Hymns are even more epical in character. It has also been suggested that the elegy is an homologous transitional type developed by the Ionians (Carriere, Wackernagel). — (2) Choral odes of the Greek drama. These are more flexible and less varied in character, less sublime and often more pathetic. Modern translations by Paley, Plumptre, Gilbert Murray, etc.; and modern imitations by Milton (Samson Agonistes), Browning (Agamemnon), Arnold (Empedocles on Etna), Swinburne (Atalanta in Calydon, Erechtheus), Bridges (Prometheus the Firegiver and other dramas). — (3) The ancient Greek and Roman personal ode (Alcaeus, Anacreon, Sappho, Horace, Catullus, etc.), identically stanzaic in form, graceful, passionate or witty, subjective and personal: practically the only kind cultivated by the Romans at all extensively. — (4) Medieval forms, analogous to (1) or (3), viz., *canzones*, *sirventés*, *Leiche*, — or the lyrics of the Crusades, such as Walther von der Vogelweide's Kreuzlied of 1228 (see Wackernagel, and Gosse's Art. Ode, Encyc. Brit.). Did the Crusades afford a communal interest and occasion comparable to the Panhellenic Games? — (5) Renaissance Latin odes, as those of Pontanus, Conr. Celtes, Joh. Secundus, Sadolet, M. A. Flaminio, J. S. Macrinus, G. Fabricius, Jean Du Bellay, G. Buchanan, and a host of others. — (6) Renaissance and other early vernacular attempts to emulate the ancient ode, both Pindaric and Horatian: see the odes of Ronsard (who took Pindar for model, and then Anacreon and Horace) and the Pléiade, and, later, of J.-B. Rousseau, Saint-Amant, and Malherbe; the odes of Ben Jonson, Drayton, Randolph, Marvell, Rochester, after the Horatian manner, identically stanzaic; the odes of Milton (Christ's Nativity, On Time, At a Solemn Music), of Pindaric exaltation — and of stately form, but not Pindaric or Horatian; the odes of Alamanni, Bernardo Tasso, Chiabrera, Guido Cassoni (Odi, Ven.: 1601), Menzini, Crescimbeni, etc.; the odes of Weckherlin (see Wackernagel, Poetik, 3d ed., 192), Opitz, Tscherning, Gryphius, von Canitz, etc. — (7) The Cowleyan, frankly irregular 'Pindarics' (1656 +), already described (see above, § 1, IV, C, The Ode; cf. Saintsbury, Hist. Eng. Prosody, 2: 338, 381, 402, etc.). See the irregular Pindaric odes of Sprat, Dryden, Otway, Swift, Yalden, Pope (for further lists see Schipper, Eng. Metrik, 2: 806 ff., Bonn: 1889; Kaluza-Dunstan, A Short Hist. of Eng. Versification, p. 371, Lond.: 1911). — (8) The modern regular ode. Ben Jonson had already written a carefully constructed Pindaric ode on the death of Sir H. Morison, but it had no immediate successors. In the reaction against and correction of the 'irregular' Pindarics Congreve's Discourse on the Pindarique Ode (1705) leads the way. Congreve was followed in his experiments with the regular form by Ambrose Philips, but soon the irregular returned to favor. Later Gray, who had studied Pindar, reintroduced the regular Pindaric with his Progress of Poesy (1754) and his Bard (1756). Collins meanwhile wrote odes, sometimes of the Lesbian-Roman type, sometimes more nearly approaching the Pindaric. Mason and Akenside, also, wrote exceedingly formal odes. Cf. Schipper, *op. cit.*, 2: 818 ff.; also above, (2). — (9) The modern romantic ode. During the nineteenth century there was little exact imitation of either the Pindaric or the Horatian ode. The romantic ode may resemble distantly the Pindaric, but it is of fluid organism; it may resemble the Horatian, but it is of more intricate stanzaic form. Among the best writers of the romantic ode are Wordsworth, Coleridge, Shelley, Keats, Tennyson, Patmore, Swinburne, Wm. Morris, Robert Bridges, Bayard Taylor, Lowell, Wm. Vaughan Moody, Woodberry. — In addition to these forms by historic stages may be mentioned one which has been cultivated in various periods. (10) "Homostrophic type" (Alden, 342), i.e. the ode "based on a single type of elaborate strophe, which may vary slightly in the course of the poem, but not sufficiently to result in contrasted types." Examples given by Alden are Spenser's two marriage odes, Collins' Superstitions of the Highlands, Coleridge's Ode to France; to which may be added some of the elaborate lyrics of Keats and Swinburne.

For somewhat similar modern developments in continental Europe see divisions above on the lyric in France, Italy, Germany, etc.

D. *The Sonnet.* On the general character (theory and technique) of the sonnet, see above, § 1, IV, D, Sonnet, and the references there listed; also many of the works annotated in § 2, especially those by Alden, Beeching, Brunetière, Erskine, Gayley, Gottschall, Guest, Gummere, Hepple, Hunt and Lee, Kaluza, Lewis, Moulton, Noble, Pattison, Quiller-Couch, Reed, Rhys, Saintsbury, F. E. Schelling, Schipper (Neuengl. Metr., pp. 835–886: an exhaustive treatment, critical and historical), Tomlinson, Viehoff, Wackernagel, Watts-Dunton, and Werner. See also E. W. Olmstead, above, § 5; Gayley and Scott, pp. 504–505.

On the origin and development of the sonnet, see the references just indicated; the various literary histories noted in the Appendix; also above, VIII, The Italian Lyric, C, The 13th Century, including References to Symonds, Waddington, Biadene, Bunge, and Vollmöller's *Jahresbericht*; see also F. J. Snell, The Fourteenth Century (1899), pp. 104–106; also above, VII, The French Lyric, G, The 16th Century, including References to Vaganay (who adds to his indispensable work a most valuable bibliography), Veyrières, Morf, Asselineau, Morel-Fatio, Pfänzel, M. Jasinski, Hist. du Sonnet en France (1903), and Vianey; also above, IX, The Spanish Lyric, B, The Golden Age of Castilian Lit., including under References the Investigaçôes etc. of Michaëlis de Vasconcellos; also above, XI, The English Lyric, C, The 16th Century, including References to Alscher, *Quart. Rev.*, Beeching, Borghesi, Carpenter, Child, Courthope, Crow, Dowden, De Marchi, Einstein, Fehse, Foxwell, Guggenheim, Hertzberg, Kastner, Koeppel, Lee, Lentzner, Noble, Owen, Padelford, Schelling, Segré, Simonds, Upham, Zocco. For the German sonnet see the work of Welti cited in § 5, and M. Freiherr von Waldberg's Deutsche Renaissancelyrik (Berlin: 1888). Many of these works, and others containing material on the sonnet, are annotated in § 5.

E. *The Song.* On the general nature of the song, see above, § 1, IV, A, Song, and the references there noted. The history of this sub-type resolves itself into a composite of the development of hundreds of its varieties. Every people possesses many sorts, and by studying comparatively distinctive kinds from each of several representative nations or races the student may endeavor to arrive inductively at the general laws governing the appearance and growth of song, both popular (*Volkslied*) and 'artistic' (*Kunstlied*). Many of the varieties of song and the references necessary to further research have been mentioned above, in the various divisions of this section.

For a systematic study of the development of song it would be well to begin with a study of the varieties discoverable among the lower races (see above, XXXIII). The prevailingly occasional character of primitive songs, the obviousness of their relations to social conditions and needs, and the simpleness of their content, form, and technique will enable the student to lay a relatively sure foundation for further study. He may proceed then to note in what ways, and by what causes, each variety of primitive song is modified in the lyrism of the more cultivated races. For instance, after studying the method of origin and the character of erotic song, as found, say, among Australians, Papuans, Esquimaux, or other lower races, he may, if he be accorded grace of infinite industry, pass in review the corresponding output of ancient

Greece, of Provence, of Italy, of the Teutons and Slavs, of Persians and Arabs, and noting in each case the characteristic differences from the primitive bases, may providentially arrive at some generalization regarding the higher stages of erotic song and the typical social environment of each stage. For suggestions as to the more important steps in variation of form, content, and accompaniment, see above, § 1, IV, A. Similar results for working songs, war songs, convivial songs, seasonal songs, satirical songs, etc., might then be obtained. Finally, if ever such sequences of development are arranged side by side, certain natural horizontal cleavages, or cross-sections, may be seen to extend over several of the series, indicative in each case of some common action of a set of social or other causes upon several varieties of song.

PART II. THE EPIC AND MINOR FORMS OF NARRATIVE POETRY

CHAPTER III

THEORY AND TECHNIQUE

SECTION 7. STATEMENT OF PROBLEMS; ANALYSIS

The term epic is regarded in the following pages not as equivalent to all narrative poetry of an objective sort — "a poetical recitation of great adventures" (Blair) — but as denominating only the more elevated styles of poetic narrative, including both folk epic and art epic. In this and the two following sections the treatment is of the theory of epic, ballad, pastoral, idyl, with only suggestions of the historical bases and the historical method of attack. In §§ 10, 11, 12 will be found an exposition of the historical view and apparatus; and in § 12 a few references to the development of metrical romance as connected with the history of the epic are included.

I. **Definitions of the Epic.** For discussions of ancient and modern definitions of the epic see the works of W. M. Dixon (Chap. I), Irene Myers, and R. M. Alden, as indicated below, § 8. It is interesting and significant to note the conclusions of Miss Myers and Professor Dixon. The former, after examining typical definitions from the chief periods of literary criticism, observes that critics are agreed upon only one feature of the epic — its narrative form — which, of course, as a differentia is not exclusive. In the rest of her work Miss Myers proceeds to differentiate the epic from other narrative poetry by peculiarities of development. Professor Dixon first notes the confusion and contradiction of the formal definitions of the epic, and their lack of universality as tested by application to the great variety of epic literature. He then turns away from all critical rules and principles that have been put forth as exclusively characteristic of the epic and seeks "principles of inclusion, i.e., such aspects or qualities as are possessed in common by those narrative poems which by the world's consent have attained some measure of success." Thus he hopes to "reach, by easier paths, the idea or controlling conception of epic poetry" (p. 21). Among these inclusive principles the following are enumerated: the epic depicts a victorious hero, who represents a country or a cause which triumphs with his triumph; it presents a great or important action, and the characters are great or important; a certain elevation of tone pervades the whole poem; the action, in comparison with the drama, is slow and episodical, and achieves no more than a diffuse unity; the larger the scope of human interest and experience, the greater the success of the poem; epic carries the imagination into the past, into the land of dreams and ideals,— to it lies open "a region forbidden to tragedy, the shining region to which imagination guides, the underworld of Virgil, the Hell, or Heaven, or Paradise of Dante or of Milton" (21–24). In sum, the epic is described as "a narrative poem, organic in structure, dealing with great actions and great characters, in a style commensurate with the lordliness of its theme, which tends to realize these characters and actions, and to sustain and embellish its subject by means of episode and amplification" (24). With this description may be compared the following:

> The epic in general, ancient and modern, may be described as a dispassionate recital in dignified rhythmic narrative of a momentous theme or action fulfilled by heroic characters and supernatural agencies under the control of a sovereign destiny. The theme involves the political or religious interests of a people or of mankind; it commands the respect due to popular tradition or to traditional ideals. The poem awakens the sense of the mysterious, the awful, and the sublime; through perilous crises it uplifts and calms the strife of frail humanity (C. M. Gayley, Principles of Poetry, pp. xciv-xcv).

Fully to understand these descriptions, as well as the spirit of Miss Myers' indictment and of her recourse to differentiae of development, the student should review ancient and modern definitions of the epic in historical order, for thus only will he note the progressive widening of the conception of the type. In this progress four fairly well-marked stages are discernible.

A. *The Formalism of Classical Antiquity.* The Aristotelian conception (references below, § 8) is almost purely formal. Epic is distinguished from drama by its narrative form, its employment of a single metre, the complex and expansive scale of its construction, and the degree to which it admits the wonderful; its unity of action is defined and contrasted with the scope of historical composition; the objective attitude of the poet is regarded as desirable; and the relative aesthetic value of epic and tragedy is debated. Horace glances at the epic as a narrative, in hexameters, of great deeds, — the "deeds of captains and of kings, and tearful wars" (Ars Poetica, 73–74).

B. *Renaissance and Neo-classical Formalism.* Renaissance conceptions of the epic were based upon Horace, or Aristotle, or both. As a whole this period of criticism is characterized by such worship of Homer and Virgil that the epic poem comes in reality to be regarded as an imitation of the Iliad or the Aeneid; by a differentiation of epic and romance so that with the former are associated strictness of plot and restraint in the use of the marvellous, but with the latter looseness of plot and lawless exaggeration; and by a multiplication of detailed 'rules' for composing epics, supposed to be drawn from inalienable principles of the perfect type, so that the whole conception of the poem is narrowed, formalized, and rendered both unhistorical and unprogressive. It was thought that a poet of fair genius and industry conscientiously following the rules might hope to produce a successful epic poem. No difference between the natural and the artificial (imitative) epic was recognized, but something was said about different degrees of success in poetic expressiveness, rhetorical coloring, and formal epic 'technique.' Under such inspiration critics in general, especially in France and England, displayed a tendency to be satisfied with the vague Horatian definition, — the epic is, practically, a long narrative poem about great leaders, a *vaste récit d'une longue action* (Boileau, Art Poétique, 3: 161). As Webbe puts it, the epic is "that princely part of poetry, wherein are displayed the noble acts and valiant exploits of puissant captains, expert soldiers, wise men, with the famous reports of ancient times" (see Haslewood's Ancient Crit. Essays, vol. II, p. 45). The moral, educational intent of the epic became a critical *sine qua non* (deriving chiefly from Horace's passage on poetry as a civilizer, Ars Poetica, 391–407), and not a few profound heads regarded Homer's myths as allegorical presentations of moral truths, — an interpretative method of hoar antiquity (cf. below, § 9, 1). The Italians, followed by the critics of other nations, developed intricate debates upon the propriety of applying Aristotelian rules to the romantic epics of Boiardo and Ariosto (see Cintio and Pigna), upon the necessity of the action being historical, and remote in time, upon the desirability of perfect characters or those with a tragic flaw, upon the propriety of employing Christian marvels ('machinery'), upon the nature of epic unity of action, the use of episodes, the desirability of a didactic purpose or allegorical method, etc., etc. For examples of Renaissance conceptions (Italian, French, English) of the epic, see Spingarn (*op. cit. infra*, § 8, 1st ed., pp. 107–124 for Vida, Daniello, Trissino, Minturno, Scaliger, Castelvetro, Giraldi Cintio, G. Pigna, Speroni, and Torquato Tasso; pp. 210–213 for Ronsard, Vauquelin de la Fresnaye, and Boileau; pp. 293–295 for Webbe, Puttenham, Sidney, and Harington); see also below, § 9. For other neo-classical definitions see Le Bossu, Mambrun, Rapin, Dacier, Voltaire, Dryden, Addison, Pope, Swift, all of whom are mentioned below in § 8 or § 9, and may be traced by means of the index. With Le Bossu we reach the *reductio ad absurdum* of formalism, didacticism, and recipe-making: he viewed the epic as "a discourse invented by art, to form the manners by such instructions as are disguised under the allegories of some one important action, which is related in verse, after a probable, diverting, and surprising manner" (cf. Mme. Dacier, and Swift's satirical recipe for making an epic poem).

C. *Philosophical Criticism of the 18th and 19th Centuries.* From Hegel, Schopenhauer, Schelling, Goethe, Schiller, Vischer, Carriere, and others has descended that school of thought which regards the epic as primarily an expression of the national spirit, differentiates it from other genres upon philosophical grounds of objectivity and the subjection of individual action to universal necessity, and distinguishes between the original, national epics and the secondary, imitative epic poem. Hegel, for instance, contends that the proper subject of the epic is "some past action, some event which, in the vast reach of its circumstances, and the multitude and interests of its relations, embraces an entire world, the life of a nation, or the entire history of an epoch."

> The totality of the beliefs of a people, religious and other, its spirit developed in the form of a real event, which is its living picture, this is the idea and form of the Epos. . . . It thus becomes the Bible for a people, though not all Bibles are Epics. . . . The Epic poem belongs to a period between the slumber of barbarism and the more civilized order. . . . The age in which the Epos is written must not be so far from the one furnishing the subject that no sympathy exists between them. If so, the performance seems artificial. . . . For the Epos the complex relations of the fixed social life are not suited. . . . So, too, the connection of man with external nature must not be artificial, but preserve its primitive and immediate character. . . . Man has not yet broken his close connection with nature, and imposed a complex machinery between it and himself. . . . The Epic treatment differs from the Dramatic. In the latter, the character creates his destiny for himself. In the former, this destiny is the result of exterior forces. Man submits to the fatal and necessary order, which may or may not be in harmony with him. But this seeming fatality is but a higher kind of justice (Kedney, pp. 278–280, *op. cit.* § 8).

By such a conception of the national, or at least broad social, significance of the epic — a conception that was perhaps latent in the minds of Aristotle and Horace, and even of some of their Renaissance followers — the idea of the nature and function of the epic was vastly widened and deepened. No longer could critics or poets speak lightly of the epic, in formal terms of rule and recipe; now it was seen and reverenced as a social colossus, a product of a unique age and genius, a monument of that past that dies whenever a modern society, complex and individualistic, divorced from nature and seething with a mass of self-conscious, progressive citizens, is born. The hope of reproducing such epics in a modern society vanished; the distinction between the folk epic and the art epic was realized. However the philosophical critics may have differed in their utterances upon the epic, whatever may be the contradictions of the major premises from which they have deduced the nature and function of the type, they are all in substantial agreement upon the social character of the great primary epic.

D. *Modern Historical Criticism.* The conception of the natural epic as a majestic national poem paved the way for a new idea about its authorship and method of development. These, too, in the opinion of many, were national or social, rather than individual, in character. The materials of the epos are not the creation of some one poet, but the evolutionary product of generations of anonymous, forgotten bards who told and retold to audiences captivated by the glamor of a glorious past the legends of the nation's heroes intertwined with the myths of national gods. From bard to bard, generation to generation, the golden stories passed in the form of lays, sagas, or ballads. Gathered into collections or gests that were at first oral, and later written, and that involved the gradual development of legend-cycles about this or that hero, critical event, or belief, these tales, freighted with the imaginative and patriotic genius of a communal people, might either continue their round of oral or written repetition age by age, until a new spirit and a new order of society should render them obsolete, or, on the other hand, they might at last be retold by a master poet of such flaming genius that in the consummate form impressed upon them by him they would become great folk or national epics.

In later individualistic stages of civilization, when the conditions of authorship are no longer naïve and anonymous, but primarily self-conscious and 'artistic,' certain art-poets endeavor to imitate the manner and grandeur of the folk epic. If with this purpose they choose some great historical, legendary, or sacred theme, long since rehearsed in literary forms that fell short of the epic, there may result a Paradise Lost or an Idylls of the King. If, instead, novel or didactic subjects or historical subjects of lesser magnitude be chosen, the chief characteristic of the folk epic is lost, and the resulting poem (such as Lucretius' De Rerum Natura, Pollok's Course of Time, or Addison's Campaign) may depart so far from the nature of the model, something of whose style alone may have been copied, that another poetic variety has been formed. But even when the subject chosen by the art-poet is at once legendary, sublime, and popular, his poem lacks the majesty, the simple, inevitable grandeur of the folk epic. Too far removed from the age of which he writes to be in untutored sympathy with it, the imaginative genius of the poet is perforce literary rather than popular, and appeals to the cultivated taste of the few rather than to the communal heart. "The folk-epic charms by the interest of its whole story and by its appeal to the whole crowd. The individual epic deals with a theme momentous, to be sure, but not of the heart warm, nor leaping from the lips of the people, — rather sought out by the poet wherewith to lift his readers (hearers no longer) to a nobler view of life" (as in the Aeneid, Divine Comedy, or Paradise Lost). "In general it may be said that the folk-epic deals with traditions which command the credence of the people by and for whom it is composed, and that the individual epic chooses its subject with a view to inculcating an ideal, historical or spiritual. The Beowulf is an epic of tradition: the component parts commanded credence because they narrated events supposed to have happened not too long ago, and the organized whole commanded the respect due to tradition. The Paradise Lost is an epic of the spirit; it tries to magnify into a universal ideal a definite creed of Christian theology" (C. M. Gayley, Principles of Poetry, p. xciv)

Compare Nettleship, as noted in § 8, on the characteristics of the literary epic; for a criticism of the distinction between the folk epic and art epic, see C. B. Bradley, also cited in § 8.

Below, in the sections on the development of Homeric criticism (§ 9, VIII, B, C; § 12), will be found an account of the rise of the historical criticism of the epic, with references to Wolf, Lachmann, and the followers of these two masters. The idea, advanced by the originators of that school, that the great national epic is the product of unconscious accretions of tales, without the agency of the final, forming hand of the master poet, is now practically obsolete. An admirable brief definition of the national epic from the other historical point of view is given by Julien Duchesne in a work noted below, § 11: "L'épopée est une production nationale, spontanément conçue à la suite d'événements extraordinaires, élaborée longtemps par le travail d'un peuple *et fixée sous sa forme définitive par le génie d'un seul homme*."

The student who has reviewed the inadequacies and contradictions of formal epic criticism and the vagueness of philosophical criticism, often retires impatiently from such discussions and turns with renewed hope to the historical method, as did Miss Myers in the dissertation noted above. But, all too soon, he is haunted with the objections to the historical differentiation that have been voiced by Professor C. B. Bradley and others; and he winds up with the belief that true characterization is to be achieved by a combination of elements from all the four stages of criticism that we have noticed. Accordingly, typical definitions of the epic now endeavor, like those of Dixon and Gayley cited at length above, to select from the riches of formal, philosophical, and historical criticism those features which seem most fully and yet exactly to describe the origin, quality, and function of the epic, ancient or modern, with due allowance for differences between the natural (folk, national, primary, original) epopee and the artificial (art, individual, secondary, imitative) epic. The student who has traversed the fields of criticism here indicated will be able to turn again to these typical definitions and see in them phrase by phrase the heritage of past criticism.

After a preliminary survey of the definitions of the epic (see further, § 8, below), the student may turn to the following problems in the study of epic theory as a whole.

II. The Nature of the Epic.

A. *The Relation of the Poet to his Work.* (1) To what extent does the epic poet reveal his personality? For the objective attitude of the epic poet, see Aristotle, Hegel, Schelling, Symonds, Lotze, W. von Humboldt, Carriere, Alden, Gummere, Gayley, Clark, Marsh. (2) What are the relative degrees of subjectivity displayed in the epic, lyric, and drama? For the element of the subjective, see Schopenhauer, Watts-Dunton, Schiller (cf. Harnack). (3) Examine the invocations of various epics, and note the opinions of Le Bossu, Dryden, Wasson, and others upon the subject. (4) Does the natural, or only the artificial, epic poet realize the historical import of the characters and events with which he deals? See Ker, Chap. I, § 2. (5) Can the nature and laws of the epic be deduced from the nature of the epical bard? See Goethe, Harnack. (6) Is the epic poet always concerned with typical, rather than particular, effects of character and action? Can epic repetitions (formulae, epithets, etc.) and the incongruities of epic similes be explained as results of this tendency toward the typical? See Panzer.

B. *The Subject of the Epic.* The following questions are worthy of consideration:

1. What is its **historical or material basis**? (*a*) In what degree is it founded on the traditions of a people? G. Paris and P. Meyer, Hegel, Ker. (*b*) In what sense is it "the child of circumstance, locality and epoch"? (*c*) Is it primarily the poetry of nature, — "revealing the mind from the aspect of the physical" (cf. Harnack)? (*d*) Should the poet choose a great catastrophe, or "an indispensable fragment from some heroic history involving the action of men and gods"? See Herder, Lotze, Ulrici, Müller, Miller, Bruchmann, Ker (pp. 20–22), Paris and Meyer, Alden, Gummere, Gayley, Marsh, etc. (*e*) Is the central interest of the epic a great national event (Green), or rather the typical sufferings

of an individual fate seen against the background of a great event in which many heroes take part, — an event which is *motivirt* by an ethical problem? Butcher, Steinthal (p. 32). (*f*) Is the poet justified in presenting an entirely imaginary world? Aristotle, Le Bossu. (*g*) Is the epic a fit vehicle for the narration of commonplace events, or of social complications — even though they be idealized? (*h*) Need it, on the other hand, deal with miraculous events? Bodmer, Schelling, Bruchmann, Gladstone, Saint-Évremond, Zimmermann (p. 5 and Note), Ker (pp. 34–38).

2. What is the **spiritual basis** — the indwelling and animating idea — of the epic; and what its consequent scope? (*a*) Is it founded upon universal intuition of the essential harmony of finite and infinite? Schelling, Carriere. Or (*b*) does it regard man as limited, not only materially but spiritually, and the determining power as super-human force? (*c*) Is it fundamentally the expression of an intuition of a divine, religious, or moral idea manifested in a sequence of deeds causally connected? Wackernagel (as cited in § 11). (*d*) Need its subject embrace "the totality of the beliefs of a people, religious and other"? Hegel; and cf. Herder, Ker, Paris and Meyer. (*e*) What epics may be cited as dealing with the religious conditions of the world? Ulrici, Gladstone, Hegel, Herder, Green, Carriere, Wasson. (*f*) What is the attitude of the epic poet to recognized mythology? Is myth necessary, or admissible, to his greatest dramatic scenes? Does he reject or refine its grosser parts? Does he refine by turning grossness into comedy, and by discovering new meanings in the old stories? See Tasso, Schelling, Ker (pp. 40–57), Paris and Meyer. (*g*) Is the heroic ideal one that is clearly defined in set terms; or is it the possession of those only who are endowed with original imagination? Is it analytically determined or creatively? formed, or in process of formation? See Ker (p. 233).

3. What is the prevailing tone or temper of the epic in respect of **free-will or necessity**, providence, or fate? (*a*) If a higher power rules the events of the epic world, should it be denominated Fate, Destiny, or the Sympathetic Divine? (*b*) Does the epic

satisfy in us a desire to look beyond our "everyday Toms and Peters" to beings ruled by a higher kind of justice? (*c*) Is, then, the poet justified in substituting the religious conceptions of his own day for those of the time of which he writes? What is the practice of Arnold (Light of Asia), Milton, Voltaire, Virgil, Lewis Morris (Epic of Hades), Wilkinson (Epic of Saul)? (*d*) Is the Christian religion adaptable to epic treatment? See Tasso, Davenant, Dryden (Discourse on Epic Poetry), Saint-Évremond, Hallam, Watts-Dunton, Bodmer, Duchesne (below, § 11); and below, § 9, under Vauquelin de la Fresnaye, Godeau, Cowley, etc. What of the mixing of Christian and pagan stories? See Cintio, Tasso, H. Coleridge, Saint-Évremond. (*e*) Compare epic with dramatic characters in their relation to destiny; and (*f*) from the same point of view discuss the tone of epic, lyric, and drama. (*g*) How does the evolution of man's conception of fate tell upon the evolution of his epics? See Herder, Hegel, Dryden, Mill, Schopenhauer, Lotze, Watts-Dunton, Sellar, Baumgart. (*h*) For the optimistic character of the epic, see Woodberry (Appreciation of Literature).

III. **The Technique of the Epic.**

A. *The Elements.* The student will naturally consider the action and its environment, the characters, and the plot.

1. *The Action.* (*a*) Should it be preferably of time past? (*b*) Cannot we have epics of the present or future? Consider the Divine Comedy, and Bickersteth's Yesterday, To-day and Forever. (*c*) What part does memory play in the composition of folk epics? and how does it difference the environment or setting from that of the art epic? (*d*) In what respect are "dimness" and "distance" favorable to the picture that the poet would paint? — to the effect that he would produce? (*e*) The contemplative tone of the folk epic, — does it spring from a consciousness of the antiquity of the events narrated? (*f*) In this respect does the Divine Comedy, regarded as an art epic, lack proportion and perspective? On these questions consult Ulrici, Hegel, Mure, Le Bossu, Dryden, Müller, Vida, Batteux. (*g*) Does

the lyric, in contradistinction to the epic, deal with the present? the drama with the past in the present? See von Hartmann, Hegel, Schopenhauer, Gummere. (*h*) On the unity of action, internal and external, see Aristotle, Le Bossu, Hallam, Lotze, Hegel. (*i*) On the greatness and dignity, the compass and simplicity of the action, see Aristotle, Schopenhauer, etc. (*j*) Should the epic treat of one small and limited action, or of many? See Aristotle, Boileau (L'Art Poétique, and the Préface, Au Lecteur, of Le Lutrin), and neo-classical critics in general as cited in § 9, below.

2. *The Characters.* (*a*) Does the success of the epic depend upon the "author's power of imagining and representing characters"? (*b*) Without dramatic representation of characters is the epic mere history or romance? See Ker (p. 19). (*c*) Are the characters rather of the typical, general, and ideal, than of the individual? Hamilton; and what is the usual *personnel*? Paris and Meyer. (*d*) Compare epic personages with similar characters in tragedy, comedy, and the modern novel. See Hamilton. Does the epic subordinate the destiny of the hero to that of the society of which he is a part, whereas tragedy is concerned only with action that springs out of individual character? See Aristotle, Hegel, and Butcher; also Gartelmann. (*e*) What effect does the element of remoteness have upon the outlines of the characters? (*f*) What effect the purely narrative as opposed to the histrionic presentation? (*g*) What effect the relation of the poet to his creations, epic or dramatic? (*h*) To what extent must the characters be significant, heroic, primitive, simple? (*i*) Should they be elaborated by psychological analyses or revealed through significant situations? Schopenhauer, Ulrici, Watts, Lotze, Hegel, Carriere. (*j*) Does the hero sum up the inspiration of the epic (Paris and Meyer)? and need his manners be virtuous? Le Bossu (Si un héros poétique doit être honnête-homme?), and Mme. Dacier. Or are the heroes of the epic "ungodly man-killers, whom we poets, when we flatter them, call heroes"? Need the hero stir the "irascible appetite," provoke murder and the "destruction of God's images"? Dryden

(IV, 287). (*k*) Is the element of the ridiculous allowable? Aristotle, Dryden, etc. (*l*) In a successful epic are traditional and newly-invented characters found side by side? (*m*) What kind of characters may the poet create and add to the number of those traditionally received? (*n*) Can we justify such poetic interpolation? and what is the place of non-traditional *personae*? (*o*) Are abstractions available as characters in the epic? Examine Paradise Lost, Divina Commedia, Gerusalemme Liberata, Klopstock's Messias, Wilkinson's Saul, Arnold's Light of the World, — and compare the older epics. See, also, *Spectator* (No. 357). (*p*) Is it safe for the poet to alter traditional traits of character?

3. *The Plot.* (*a*) Discuss Aristotle on the compass — "beginning, middle, and end"; on unity of purpose, Watts-Dunton's distinction between Eastern and Western epics (Art. Poetry, Encyc. Brit.). (*b*) Discuss Dryden on the epic as the "draft of human life *in extenso*." (*c*) The significance of the situations as revealing character? Consult Schopenhauer. (*d*) The quality of situations as determined by the aesthetic emotions appropriate to epic poetry? Aristotle, Hegel, Hirn. (*e*) The knot and the solution, revolutions and discoveries, catastrophe? See Aristotle, Herder, Dryden, Addison, Le Bossu. (*f*) The canon: *In medias res rapit*? Horace, Herder, Dryden. (*g*) Cf. *in medias res rapit* with Schopenhauer's dictum: "The characters should be introduced in a state of peace," and Lotze's, von Humboldt's, and Hegel's view that the subject should be developed in a calm, leisurely manner. (*h*) To what degree and with what treatment are sensational situations admissible? (*i*) What is the justification and what the function of episodes? (*j*) Does the interest of the epic center especially in its plot, its episodes, its characters, its descriptions, its spiritual tone, or its impersonal style? Compare the drama. Ker, Gartelmann. (*k*) Are not episodes in a modern epic likely to lower the tone of the poem to that of a romance or novel? and (*l*) when feigned of a traditional hero do they not offend the reader's credulity? Examples? (*m*) Should the epic end happily, — with "a natural and soothing solution"? (*n*) The

technique of plot? See Aristotle, Le Bossu, Dryden, von Humboldt, etc. (*o*) Note Aristotle's dictum (Poet. xxiv, 10) concerning the advantage of probable impossibilities over improbable possibilities; also concerning unreasonable circumstances. Cf. von Humboldt.

B. *The Form.* With regard to **Form**, the subjects demanding especial attention are: (1) the relative prominence of narrative and dialogue; (2) the comparative excellence of epic continuity and lyric intensity; (3) the relative advantages of narration and dramatic presentation, and the admissibility of lyric and dramatic elements in the epic; (4) the nature of the simile and of other figurative language in the epic; (5) the qualities of rhetoric and of metre most appropriate to the epic; (6) the necessity to the epic of verse form (consider Malory's Morte d'Arthur, Fénelon's Télémaque, and prose translations of the great epics; cf. Fielding and Carriere as cited below); (7) reasons for supposing that the romance has superseded the epic as a narrative type, — Spielhagen; (8) styles of representation open to the romance as compared with the epic: e.g., prose or verse; comic, tragic, or pathetic conception of life; narration in the third person, or in the first, or by rotation of narrators, or by conversation, or by diary, or letters, or by a combination of these and other forms, — see Spingarn (p. 112 ff. 1st ed.), Elze (Grund. d. engl. Philol., pp. 356–357); (9) the relative sublimity of style in epic and tragedy, — see Dryden (Discourse on Epic Poetry). In general, see Fischer.

IV. **The Varieties of the Epic.** The examination will naturally fall under two heads: Kinds of epic, as determined by subject and treatment; and Stages, as determined by historic development.

A. *The Kinds.* Aristotle, Hegel, Baumgart, Hallam (Introd. Lit. of Europe, vol. IV, p. 417), Gladstone, W. von Humboldt, Kleinpaul, Nettleship, Wackernagel, Fischer, Gottschall, and others (Alden, Gummere, Gayley, etc.) supply criteria, an examination of which should aid the student in making the former classification. By some the epic is classified as naïve, artificial, artistic; by others as national and literary; by others as heroic, lyrical, and dramatic; etc. Fischer (p. ix) divides the epic in respect of content or character into the heroic and the erotic; in respect of origin, into the popular and the artificial; in respect of *tendenz*, into the fabulous and the psychological. But here we approach the classification by B, *The Stages of Development*, and for that the student is referred to §§ 10–12.

V. **The Function of the Epic.** In what manner does the epic affect the emotions? to what degree does it conserve the religious idea, or the political, or influence personal ideals of conduct? Does it fulfil any of the functions of history?

A. *Aesthetic.* (1) What is the prevailing tone of the epic? and does this change as civilization advances? (2) If the aim be consistently to awaken feelings of wonder, admiration, surprise, is not the emotional climax to be found in the sublime? Hegel, Carriere, Gayley. (3) Is there not an aesthetic element of contemplative sadness occasioned by the epic atmosphere of predestination? (4) Is there not also a consciousness of social solidarity, and consequently an awakening of religious or national enthusiasm,—a result of the insignificance of the individual as an unrelated unit and of reverential awe before the mystery that envelops existence? (5) Compare the emotions aroused by the lyric and the drama. See von Humboldt, Hegel, Lotze, Green, Miller, Dryden, Herder, Gladstone, E. Wolff. (6) What differences in the aesthetic functions of epic and tragedy are due to their different modes of representation? See Horace, Dryden, etc. (7) Is the aesthetic effect more or less violent, more or less enduring, than that of tragedy? (8) Is the epic better suited to the treatment of long-standing emotional conceptions of national, or general, spiritual interest, tragedy to the treatment of sudden and individual passions? (9) In short, of what kind and degree is the catharsis effected by the epic? See E. Wolff. Compare Dryden's *dictum*: "No heroick poem can be writ on the Epicurean principles" (Disc. on Ep. Poetry).

B. *Ethical and Religious.* (1) See Dryden and Le Bossu on the virtue of heroic example. (2) The moral of the story. See Paris and Meyer, Mme. Dacier, Freybe, Gummere. (3) Discuss Aristotle's "ethical and pathetic" as applied to the Odyssey and the Iliad. See Poetics, xxiv, 2. (4) Has the modern epic a function in our modern development? (5) Does the moral function of the epic lie in its revelation of the social will organized in the life of nations, and in a collision that is social rather than individual? See Woodberry (App. of Lit.). (6) Epics as the Bibles of the world. (7) To what degree may the spiritual basis, the tone or temper mentioned above (II, B, 2 and 3), the religious-aesthetic emotions (V, A, (3), (4)) be regarded as having practical effect upon the life of the individual and society? Green, Paris and Meyer, Carriere, Gladstone, Hegel, Herder, Monge, Sellar, Shairp, Shelley, Stedman.

C. *Historical.* (1) To what extent has the epic been a conserver of religious beliefs, of social and moral convention, of national ideals? Hegel, Green, Paris and Meyer, Sellar. (2) What, in these respects, is its relation to tradition? (3) Has the folk epic fulfilled the function of a history as yet undifferentiated from poetry, romance, and religion? See Herder, Hegel, Posnett, Ker, Gummere. (4) Was not its primal value largely euhemeristic and aetiological: preserving by the former device, in myths of the gods, exaggerated adventures of historical individuals; and by the latter, crude attempts to assign causes for tribal customs, ceremonials, etc., the origin of which had been forgotten? See Schelling, Ker, Lang's Myth, Ritual and Religion, Frazer's Golden Bough, Gayley's Classic Myths (new ed., Chap. XXX). (5) Note the following:

> In Virgil's poetry a sense of the greatness of Rome and Italy is the leading motive of a passionate rhetoric, partly veiled by the "chosen delicacy" of his language. Dante and Milton are still more faithful exponents of the religion and politics of their time. Even the French epics are pervaded by the sentiment of fear and hatred of the Saracens. But in Homer the interest is purely dramatic. There is no strong antipathy of race or religion; the war turns on no political event; the capture of Troy lies outside the range of the Iliad. Even the heroes are not the chief national heroes of Greece. The interest lies wholly (so far as we can see) in the picture of human action and feeling (Monro in Art. Homer, Encyc. Brit.).

VI. **Other Special Characteristics** of the epic may be discovered by systematic comparison with the lyric, the drama, the ballad, the metrical romance, the idyl, and the novel. See Aristotle's parallel between epic and tragedy; also Müller, Dryden, Watts-Dunton, Herder, Schopenhauer, Hegel, Mure, Spielhagen. On the comparative excellence of epic, lyric, drama, and novel as types of literary expression, see Aristotle, Herder, Müller, Hamilton, Watts-Dunton, J. S. Mill, von Hartmann, Schiller, Sainte-Beuve (Étude sur Virgile, pp. 151–155), Fischer (Introduction). What of Goethe's suggestion that the novel is the subjective epic of modern life (Maximen und Reflexionen, 2te Abt., 1821–26)? Note the characteristics of the mock-heroic (Fournel), the burlesque romance, the metrical satire, the didactic poem — as *per contra* suggestive of the positive qualities of the true epic. A comparison of Paradise Lost with the lesser English epics will indicate emphatically the requirements of the type. Among the minor epics, if they may all be called epics, are: Daniel's Civil Wars, Drayton's Barons' Wars, Davenant's Gondibert, Chamberlayne's Pharonnida, Benlowes' Theophila, Dryden's Annus Mirabilis, Sir Richard Blackmore's Prince Arthur (1695), King Arthur (1697), Alfred (1723), Cowley's Davideis, Richard Glover's Leonidas, William Wilkie's Epigoniad, Pye's Alfred, Southey's Madoc, and Roderick, Landor's Gebir, Atherstone's Fall of Nineveh and Israel in Egypt. Further notices in Dixon. For several of the forgotten epics of English literature, see Saintsbury's Minor Poets of the Caroline Period (2 vols. Oxford: 1905–06).

VII. **Minor Forms of Narrative Verse.** The student may wish to study the general theory and technique of the sub-species of narrative verse. These, as already said, we do not attempt fully to cover. The minor forms may be enumerated with reference to their relation to the epic as follows: (1) Predecessors of the epic: hero-saga, gest, chanson; (2) Cognate forms: ballad, mock-heroic, heroic poem; (3) Allied forms: metrical tale, metrical romance (modern), allegory, parable and fable, idyl, pastoral, metrical satire, burlesque romance (Hudibras).

For brief, introductory notices of these forms, see Alden, Gayley (Principles of Poetry), Gummere (Poetics), Hudson, Wackernagel, Carriere (Poesie), Gottschall. Further study should be directed along the lines marked out below, § 9. The following notes on the theory and technique of Ballad, Pastoral, and Idyl may be of aid to the beginner; for historical consideration, see below, § 10, IX.

A. *Ballad.*

1. *Manner.* From the three possible methods of expression — singing, saying, doing — are derived the three primary kinds of poetry, — song, recital, and drama. Certain secondary types, however, combine the qualities of two or more of the primary kinds. The idyl, for instance, may combine lyric and dramatic qualities with a narrative, descriptive, or reflective recital. The pastoral is a poem on a particular subject, — the shepherd; it may be lyrical, epical, dramatic, with qualities also descriptive, novelistic, idyllic. The ballad combines song and recital. In its earlier stages it is both a recital, or saying, and a song; in later stages it loses something of its lyrical tune while its narrative content comes to the front. It also assumes dramatic quality to the degree in which the singer or reciter of the poem impersonates the speaking characters. See Gayley, Princ. and Prog. of English Poetry, xci–xciv; on dramatic quality, G. M. Miller, as noted below, § 11.

2. The *verse* of the ballad is characteristically a simple measure, the lyrical effect of which is often heightened by a chorus, burden, or refrain. "The chorus was a stanza sung by the throng *after* each stanza of the ballad; the burden was a stanza sung *with* each stanza of the ballad as a kind of accompaniment; the refrain was the line (or lines) sung by the throng after certain lines in each stanza of the ballad" (Armes, Old English Ballads, xxxiii–xxxiv).

3. The *subject-matter* of the ballad is deeds, which may be historical, romantic, or mythical. The war-ballad — historical and legendary, or mythical — is one of the most frequent and important varieties of the ballad. Adventures of love and outlawry and experiences of the supernatural are also common subjects. But

with the feelings, moods, and thoughts of the singer — as distinct from deeds — the ballad is not concerned; herein is it distinguished from the purely lyrical poem. 'Waly, waly, gin love be bony' is, therefore, not a ballad even though it involves narrative. See Kittredge, p. xi.

4. *Kinds of Ballad: their Technique.* The most convenient division is that according to origin, for which see below, under the history of the ballad, § 10, IX, A.

The *traditional or folk ballad* is an anonymous popular creation of an individual composer, or, according to another theory, of a singing, dancing, improvising crowd; it is handed down by word of mouth from generation to generation; its technique corresponds to its popular origin and oral quality: especially noticeable are its "naïve accumulation of particulars, repetition of statement, colloquial conversation, question and answer, set phrases and refrain." "It appeals by pictorial images rather than by the poetic figure (or image consciously constructed); not by emotional analysis or refined suggestion, but by wave after wave of detail. It is the production of a civilization near the soil, dominated by common social, emotional, and artistic sympathies; and it is founded upon some interest that is permanent and universal in the heart of the community" (Gayley, *loc. cit.*).

Further consideration of these characteristics may be indicated briefly. (1) The story is told simply, briefly, and abruptly; the action proceeds by leaps and bounds, without careful transitions, often without notice of a change of speakers, and occasionally it even breaks off without specific indication of the dénouement. Much is left to the art of the reciter, much to the imagination and inference of the listener. (2) The narrative is impersonal, objective, and concrete. (3) 'Character drawing' is absent; typical rather than individual characters are presented by dramatic suggestion. (4) The setting of the story is briefly indicated or not at all. Settings are typical. Individualizing description of places or persons is rare, though conventional phrases of description are common. (5) Repetitions of many sorts are a distinguishing feature. "A reading of the three hundred and five extant English ballads will show that their makers lacked invention; the same plots, situations, and groups of characters appear again and again, and the words used to narrate the events and describe the actors are the same in ballad after ballad" (W. D. Armes, Old English Ballads, p. xxviii). The 'ballad formulas' — such as 'lith and listen,' 'under the greenwood tree,' 'the first step she stepped . . ., the next step she stepped' — well illustrate the repetition of phrases. What is the psychology of such repetitions? When the story is told in a succession of similar, cumulative stages, whole stanzas and parts of stanzas may be repeated. Often a whole stanza is repeated save for one change which expresses an advance in action or idea ('incremental repetition'). The employment of chorus, burden, and refrain also involves repetition. (6) The naïve reference to silk, gold, silver, precious gems, and other gorgeous array is characteristic of the simpleness of the popular mind; so also, perhaps, is the use of typical numbers, such as three and seven. (7) Speaking animals and the supernatural often play a part in the story.

These characteristics are well summed up in the following definition: A ballad is "a short narrative poem, adapted for singing, simple in plot and metrical structure, divided into stanzas, and characterized by complete impersonality so far as the author or singer is concerned" (Kittredge, p. xi).

For exposition and illustration of these and other characteristics of the popular ballad see Child, Gummere, Lang, Kittredge, Steenstrup, Hart, Armes, Henderson, Miller, Sidgwick, Wirth, as noted below in § 8 or § 11. For an admirable brief conspectus see Armes or Hart (English Popular Ballads); for detailed analysis, Hart (Ballad and Epic); for extensive discussion and illustration, Gummere (Old Eng. Ballads, Beginnings of Poetry, The Popular Ballad, Prim. Poetry and the Ballad, etc.).

The *art ballad*, or artistic ballad, is the creation of a self-conscious poet who strives to imitate the form of the popular ballad. Ballads of this sort are not anonymous; they are not preserved by word of mouth, but by writing and printing. Moreover, the native flavor, the popular tang, the naïve simpleness, the characteristic fascination of the popular ballad are but seldom attained by the art-poet. Such qualities belong to a particular condition of society, the key to the understanding of which is the very anonymity and impersonality of poetic utterance which belong to the traditional ballad. Only by the happiest of chances can these qualities be achieved by a poet who in an entirely different society, and subject to the learned criteria of a self-conscious artistry, writes under his own signature. Sophistication of conception and phrase, refinement and uncommonness of effort and effect, idiosyncrasy of style, — these are so inherent in the art-poet's way of thinking, feeling, and speaking that they almost inevitably appear in his imitations of the popular ballad. Scott's ballads show how close the art-ballad *may* approach the popular form. La Belle Dame sans Merci and The Rime of the Ancient Mariner are such splendid transformations of the ballad as may be attained by poets of highest imaginative vigor. For other examples see the ballads of Rossetti, Dobson, Macaulay, etc. (compare Gummere, Pop. Ballad, 319–321; R. S. Forsythe, Modern Imitations of the Popular Ballad, in *Jr. Eng. and Germ. Phil.*, 13: 88. 1914, — a classified list; V. Beyer, Die Begründung der ernsten Ballade durch G. A. Bürger (in *Quellen und Forsch.*, No. 97. 1905); K. Bode, Die Bearbeitung der Vorlagen in Des Knaben Wunderhorn, in *Palaestra*, No. 76. 1909; W. Schulze, Gustav Schwab als Balladendichter, in *Palaestra*, No. 126. 1914).

B. *Pastoral.* An admirable introduction to the general characteristics, essential quality, and chief significance of the pastoral is contained in the first chapter of W. W. Greg's indispensable Pastoral Poetry and Pastoral Drama (Lond.: 1906). We here follow his account. Pastoral poetry presents in epic (idyllic), lyric, dramatic, or novelistic form the life of shepherds. But the essential quality of pastoral lies not in a "realistic or at least recognizably natural presentation of actual shepherd life." To be sure the best pastoral poetry — say that of Theocritus and the Elizabethan lyrists — does approach to the natural, but by far the greater part of pastoral literature is distinguishably artificial in its way of conceiving and treating the life of the shepherd. The reason for this lies in the conditions under which the art-pastoral has originated, viz., the complex, artificial manners of court and city society. Though sophisticated society finds a new interest in affably discerning the engaging simpleness of pastoral life, it cannot but see and copy that life in a spirit that breathes less of the fold and the upland than of the court and drawing-room. It celebrates its make-believe escape from its own tiresome complexity by pastoral *bal-masque*, with Corydon in breeches and lace and Daphnis in silk and satin, or by the ideal play under the wattled cotes and turfed roofs of a Trianon: Sidney's Arcadia and Montemayor's Diana are representative of the greater bulk of pastoral literature. At Alexandria and Rome, Florence, Ferrara, and Versailles, the pastoral has flowered in the over-heated atmosphere of the court. Indeed, as Professor Marsh says, "pastoral poetry affects the manner or matter of rustic life, not for accurate description, but as a purely artistic device for conveying the interests and emotions of the poet himself, or of the society not rural in which he lives." "Between the simply sensuous and the deep moral feeling for nature lies," according to Professor Mackail, "the broad field of the pastoral. . . . It looks on nature, as it looks on human life, through a medium of art and sentiment; and its treatment of nature depends less on the actual world around it than on the prevalent art of the time" (Select Epigrams from the Greek Anthology, 1890, p. 57). Thus, too, Mr. Greg writes: "What does appear to be a constant element in the pastoral as known to literature is a recognition of a contrast, implicit or expressed, between pastoral life and some more complex type of civilization." Ruskin, then, was in error when he asserted that "all good poetry descriptive of rural life is essentially pastoral"; and Dr. Johnson, too, when he maintained that the pastoral is "a poem in which any action or passion is represented by its effects upon a country life."

Mr. Greg continues:

> Pastoral literature must not be confounded with that which has for its subjects the lives, the ideas, and the emotions of simple and unsophisticated mankind, far from the centers of our complex civilization. The two may be in their origin related, and they occasionally, as it were, stretch out feelers towards one another, but the pastoral of tradition lies in its essence as far from the human document of humble life as from a scientific treatise on agriculture or a volume of pastoral theology. . . . Thus the shepherds of pastoral are primarily and distinctively shepherds; they are not mere rustics engaged in sheepcraft as one out of many of the employments of mankind. As soon as the natural shepherd-life had found an objective setting in conscious artistic literature, it was felt that there was after all a difference between hoeing turnips and pasturing sheep; that the one was capable of a particular literary treatment which the other was not.

The significance, then, of the pastoral "is to be sought in the fact that the form is the expression of instincts and impulses deep-rooted in the nature of humanity, which, while affecting the whole course of literature, at times evince themselves most clearly and articulately here; that it plays a distinct and distinctive part in the history of human thought and the history of artistic expression."

For a brief list of works on pastoral poetry see below, § 10, IX, B, Pastoral.

C. *Idyl.*

1. *Nature of the Idyl.* Alexandrian grammarians applied the term 'idyl' (**εἰδύλλιον**, a little type, shape, or, possibly, picture) to almost any sort of short poem. Edmund Gosse observes that "**εἰδύλλιον** was not used consciously as the name of a form of verse, but as a diminutive of **εἶδος**, and merely signified 'a little piece in the style of' whatever adjective might follow. Thus the idyls of the pastoral poets were **εἰδύλλια αἰπολικά**, little pieces in the goatherd style. We possess ten of the so-called 'idyls' of Theocritus, and these are the type from which the popular idea of this kind of poem is taken. But it is observable that there is nothing in the technical character of these ten very diverse pieces which leads us to suppose that the poet intended them to be

regarded as typical. In fact, if he had been asked whether the poem was or was not an idyl he would doubtless have been unable to comprehend the question. As a matter of fact, the first of his poems, the celebrated 'Dirge for Daphnis,' has become the prototype, not of the modern idyl, but of the modern elegy; and the not less famous 'Festival of Adonis' is a realistic mime. It was the six little epical romances, if they may be so called, which started the conception of the idyl of Theocritus. It must be remembered, however, that there is nothing in ancient literature which justifies the notion of a form of verse recognized as an 'idyl'" (Art. Idyl, Encyc. Brit., 11th ed.). Very soon, however, the terms 'pastoral' and 'idyl' came to be used synonymously. Possibly because Theocritus was preëminently a pastoral poet and because, in an Alexandrian collection of his short-pieces, or εἰδύλλια, pastoral poems predominated, the term 'idyl' came to have a pastoral association. The pastorals, or bucolics, of Virgil, imitative of Theocritean poems but obscuring rustic naïveté by a political *tendenz*, were known not as idyls but as eclogues (literally, 'selections'). Renaissance writers applied the term 'idyl' to imitations of Theocritus and Virgil (see the Renaissance poetics mentioned in §§ 2, 8). Modern critics have generally assumed that the pastoral idyl is truly representative of the idyllic sub-species, but, with due regard to the extension of its characteristic atmosphere to allied subjects, have defined the idyl as a poem descriptive of the simple ways, deeds, and environment of a rustic or at least burgher people, — "ein ungezäuntes Gartenleben unter einem blauen Himmel," as Richter says. From this usage our adjective 'idyllic' derives its meaning.

On the meaning of εἰδύλλια and its derivatives see Stephanus; Croiset, Hist. litt. grecque, 2d ed., 5: 183; G. Knaack, Art. Bukolik, in Pauly-Wissowa, Real-Encyc. (1899); Christ, in *Verhand. der 26. Philologenversam. in Würzburg* (1868), 49; C. Kattein, Histoire du mot 'idylle,' in Mélanges de phil. offerts à F. Brunot (Paris: 1904), cf. *Romania*, 34: 309. 1905; E. Gosse, as noted above; E. Legrand, Étude sur Théocrite (Paris, 1898); A. C. Clark, Art. Theocritus, Encyc. Brit., 11th ed.; M. H. Shackford, Def. of the Pastoral Idyl (in *Pubs. M. L. A.* 19 (N. S. 12): 583–592); R. T. Kerlin, Theocritus in English Literature (Lynchburg, Virginia: 1910; Yale Thesis), 181. — On English usage: Moulton, Cholmeley, Symonds, Hardie, Chambers, Courthope (Hist. Eng. Poetry), Greg, as noted below, § 8; Mackail, *op. cit.*

Some critics, however, noting a great variety of both manner and subject-matter in poems that may be denominated idyls, return in part, at least, to the original meaning of the term and apply it to brief poems of any one of the major types.

> The idyl may be a diamond edition of any of the three poetic kinds, — lyric, epic, or dramatic, — or a mosaic in miniature of the different varieties in each. . . . The idyl is sometimes distinguished from other poems by the fact that it presents a picture; it is always distinguished from the major types of poetry by the fact that it presents the qualities of one or another of them, in a reduced and exquisitely delicate replica. . . . Such pastorals as the Book of Ruth, Spenser's Shepherd's Calendar, and all the rural idyls of Theocritus are little paintings, like the *genre* pictures of the Dutch School. They present a fragment of life, but they present it in every detail. The idyl may deal also with domestic, or social, even heroic, themes. The first kind is well represented by the Hebrew Book of Tobit or Burns's Cotter's Saturday Night. The social idyl may be of city or of court; it has been cultivated with great success by the Greeks and the French. The heroic kind is represented by the Book of Esther and by Tennyson's Idylls of the King. The application of the term to the latter may be justified by both interpretations of the type [the miniature variety, the picture]. The Idylls of the King are an epic in a rose-window; each episode — atmosphere, scenes, images, and words — is stained with translucent color (C. M. Gayley, Principles and Progress of English Poetry, ci–cii).

If the exposition ended there, it would seem to allow the idyl no constant specific character other than brevity and pictorial quality; and it would justify Gosse's conclusion that "on the whole, it is impossible to admit that the idyl has a place among definite literary forms." If, on the one hand, the term refers only to scale of treatment and connotes no peculiarity of matter or manner, what can be called an idyllic lyric? Any brief lyric? And if all lyrics are by nature brief, — the so-called long lyric, like

In Memoriam or Spenser's Epithalamium, being merely a series of lyric units, — are all particularly brief lyrics idyls? Are all epigrams, for instance, idyls? If, on the other hand, a descriptive or picturesque manner be insisted upon as also an essential, does the difficulty disappear? Are all picturesque lyrics (all of which, correctly estimated, are brief) idyls? And, extending the idea, may we apply the term 'idyl' to all brief heroic poems and dramas which are conceived and executed in picturesque fashion? And, lastly, are these traits of brevity and the picturesque so essentially characteristic of the majority of poems that have been called idyls that we can afford to refuse the title 'idyl' to those, if there be such, which lack the picturesque?

Upon the descriptive or picturesque character of the idyls most authorities have commented. "I have said," continues Professor Gayley, "that the idyl does not always present a picture; the manner, however, is generally pictorial. It is as if the poet were illuminating literature with a brush. The analogy holds true, more particularly, of the idyl dealing with rural or pastoral scenes. In the twinkling of an eye the painter-poet has caught the color as well as the human interest of the scene. The process is so swift that man and nature are reproduced as one. It is not so much that nature seems to speak with a human voice, as that she wears the human air; she is enveloped in a human atmosphere. She invites communion, because man has communicated himself to her" (*loc. cit.*). — Again, Wackernagel has attempted to deduce the peculiar nature of the idyl from its paradoxical combination of the narrative and descriptive manners (Poetik, 133–137). See Symonds, Chambers, Stedman (Victorian Poets, 269), Bruchmann, Baumgart, von Schelling.

But from what has so far been said we begin to perceive that the matter of the idyl is not nature or a fragment of life in its spontaneity, nor the manner merely lyric, epic, or dramatic in minute pictorial detail, but that the poet has communicated his consciously artistic conception to the matter and made literature out of the matter thus transformed. He invests nature or the fragment of life with a mood and he artistically illuminates that mood. In other words:

> The idyl is the product of a consciously artistic stage of civilization. Even the simplest pastorals — much more the subtle elaborations of social and heroic themes — imply an effort on the part of the poet to return to nature, and by means of highly developed processes of art to emphasize such of her features as seem to him beautiful. The choral song and the primitive ballad are at one extreme of poetic art. They exist for natural expression and not adornment. At the other extreme is the idyl, which exists for adornment and minute detail and for personal expression of the mood with which the poet has invested nature (Gayley, *op. cit.*, cii).

Hegel would arbitrarily limit the type to the portrayal of man in his most natural or primitive conditions. "Human nature is represented as rising out of its animal rudeness, and full of the gaiety which is nothing else than the spiritual element gradually refining itself" (Kedney, 281). The limitation is hardly true: the nature need not be emerging from the primitive; it may be something other than gay; and the spiritual element is more generally refined by the poet than by itself. The more generally accepted view is that already stated: the idyl is a consciously artistic expression of a sophisticated return to nature on the part of a highly artificial, *fin de siècle* society, such as Alexandrian society of the time of Theocritus, Roman society of the time of Virgil, and the courtly society of Florence, Paris, Versailles, or London in the days of Poliziano, Sannazaro, Guarini, Tasso, Spenser, Jonson, Fletcher, Milton, Pope, and others.

The description and appreciation of nature found particularly in the pastoral idyl have led critics to philosophize upon the affinities of the idyl in general with other poetic forms. This has been done systematically by Schiller in his essay On Simple and Sentimental Poetry. "When the poet opposes nature to art, and the ideal to the real, so that nature and the ideal form the principal object of his pictures, and that the pleasure we take in them is the dominant impression, I call him an *elegiac* poet." Two classes are distinguished. "Either nature and the ideal are objects of sadness, when one is represented as lost to man and the other as unattained; or both are objects of joy, being represented to us as reality. In the first case it is *elegy* in the narrower sense of the term; in the second case it is the *idyl* in its most extended acceptation." Schiller also distinguishes two sophisticated attitudes toward nature, the one springing from the indolence of the highly civilized man who sees in the simplicity of nature an opportunity for repose, and the other springing from the wounded moral sense of the individual who sees in the simplicity of nature a harmony in striking contrast to the disorder of his own complex civilization. For further philosophical disquisition — for the most part applicable, like this, primarily to the pastoral idyl — see the works of Vischer, Carriere, von Hartmann, and other German aestheticians. That the idyl in general presents only the joyous aspect of nature or human life is more than doubtful. If so, what shall we do with Tennyson's Lancelot and Elaine, and Guinevere?

Further discussion under the history of the idyl (see below, § 10, IX, C).

The *function* of the idyl has generally been found in that healing effect of a return to nature or, at least, to the simple and natural, which the idyl offers to sophisticated urbanism: "The reaction against the world that is too much with us, is, after all, . . . the note that is struck with idyllic sweetness in Theocritus, and, rising to its fullest pitch of lyrical intensity, lends a poignant charm to the work of Tasso and Guarini" (Greg, pp. 6–7). But we need not dwell upon this obvious fact except to suggest that some comparison may be drawn between the sophisticated demand for brevity which produced the idyl and the similar appetency which has been satisfied by the modern short-story. A significant but debatable conception of the idyl, which though related to its characteristic brevity yet goes deeper and would distinguish its function from that of the short-story, is suggested by Krause, who holds that in the idyl beauty is present as a harmony of life transpiring without negation, limitation, or destruction (see E. von Hartmann, 3: 439).

2. The *technique* of the idyl may be studied as follows:

(*a*) *In General.* (1) Has the idyl a technique of its own, and may it be deduced from that combination of brevity and the picturesque which perhaps is the essential formal trait of the type, and from the peculiar mood and function of the idyl? or from its combination of narrative and descriptive methods (Wackernagel)? (2) Does its technique derive from epic, lyric, and drama, singly and in combination (Gayley)? or from epic and drama rather than lyric (Symonds, Greek Poets, The Idyllists)? (3) Does the idyl generally affect any peculiar employment or combination of narrative, description, dialogue, monologue, *débat*, and songs? (See Chambers, Cholmeley, Courthope.) (4) Can common characteristics be detected in the prosodical forms which have been chiefly employed in idyllic composition? (5) To what extent has country dialect been employed to heighten the idyllic effect? (See Chambers.)

(*b*) *Plot.* (1) Is plot necessary to the idyl, or is the poet content with the artistic effect of the brief, harmonious presentation of the picturesque? (2) What variety of plot development may be noted? from simple pictures almost devoid of plot, to complicated stories that even embody sub-plots? (3) Is the plot managed in direct, explicit fashion, or indirectly with a certain impressionism or picturesque suggestion, whereby natural environment symbolizes or enhances the central idea of the story? Compare plot-technique of the short-story. (4) Is unity of plot characteristic of the idyl? (5) At what point in the story does the idyl begin? end? (6) Does the idyl affect any particular sort of dénouement? or suspense? (7) To what extent is the plot furthered by the dialogue of the characters? by situation?

(*c*) *Character.* (1) The chief problem lies in the relative naturalness and artificiality, in the truth to life, of the characters depicted. What has been the practice of the great idyllists? Does a certain degree of artificiality enhance the idyllic effect? Compare the 'Dresden Shepherdess.' (2) Is character development inconsistent with the scope of the idyl? (3) How is character revealed? (4) Does the brevity of the poem insure consistency of character?

(*d*) *Action.* (1) Is action represented directly, dramatically? or does the idyllist prefer to suggest action, character, and emotion by the symbolism of environment? (2) How are action and natural description reconciled in presentation? (3) Is the idyl more concerned with situation than with action?

(*e*) *Style.* In addition to questions noted above, under (*a*) In General: (1) Does the author lose himself in his story and description? or is the idyl a subtle method of self-realization? or both? (2) What of the flexibility of idyllic style, or manner? Have these varied greatly from age to age? (3) What of sincerity and artificiality of style? Contrast Theocritus with his Alexandrian, Roman, and Renaissance imitators; or the poems of these last with the natural pastoral idyl which was revived by Crabbe, Burns, Goethe, Barnes, Wordsworth, Keats, Tennyson, and others. (4) Is the descriptive style of the idyl characterized by fidelity to nature? or by quaintness of conceit? Contrast as above.

For early essays upon the nature of the idyl see the list in Blankenburg, Art. Hirtengedichte. Representative are: M. A. de Saint-Amant (1653), as noted below, § 9, VI, B; G. Colletet, Discours sur le poème bucolique où il est traité de l'éclogue, de l'idylle, etc. (Paris: 1657); R. Rapin, Diss. de Carmine Pastorali, in his book of eclogues (Paris: 1659), tr. into English by Creech (1684), and prefixed to the latter's trans. of Theocritus; B. de Fontenelle, Discours sur la nature de l'éclogue (Paris: 1688), — a famous and authoritative essay in its day, which did much to encourage the China Shepherdess affectations of the 18th-century pastoral; Abbé C. C. Genest, Dissertation sur la poésie pastorale, ou de l'idylle et de l'églogue (Paris: 1707); A. Pope, Discourse on Pastoral Poetry (1709); *The Spectator*, No. 523; *The Guardian*, Nos. 22, 23, 28, 30, 32; *The Rambler*, Nos. 36, 37; *The Adventurer*, No. 92.

For later essays see in addition to those already mentioned the references given below, § 10, under the history of the idyl; also Sainte-Beuve, essay on Theocritus in Portraits Littéraires (1844); W. S. Landor, Idyls of Theocritus, in *For. Quart. Rev.*, 30: 161. 1842, and Heroic Idyls (1863); B. L. Gildersleeve, Art. Theocritus in Johnson's Univ. Cyclop.; J. Macgilwray, An Essay on the Greek Pastoral Poets, in *Classical Journal*, 17: 74–84, 18: 30–47, 280–298, 20: 134–141. 1818–19; Oliver Yorke (F. S. Mahoney), Greek Pastoral Poets, in

Fraser's Mag., 12: 222–241, 394–408, 541–550, 13: 92–104. 1835; Lowth, Lects. on Sacred Poetry of the Hebrews (Eng. tr. by G. Gregory, 1787); Charles le Goffic, Art. Idylle, in La Grande Encyclopédie; W. Moggride, Idyllic Poets; Leigh Hunt, A Jar of Honey from Mount Hybla.

SECTION 8. GENERAL REFERENCES

For references on the general principles of art, poetry, and versification, and remarks on the value of such works in relation to the study of treatises on literary types, see the paragraphs that introduce § 2, above.

Many of the references cited below, § 11, may also be consulted by the student of theory and technique.

ABERCROMBIE, L. The Epic. The Art and Craft of Letters Series. Lond.: n.d.

A brief, facile sketch, gossipy but with much good sense, of "conspicuous instances of epic poetry . . . as stages of one continuous artistic development." These stages are characterized inadequately but suggestively. The criticism of the distinction between folk epic and art epic (Chap. II) should be compared with the more careful article of Professor C. B. Bradley (see below).

ADAM, F. Die Aristotelische Theorie vom Epos nach ihrer Entwickelung bei Griechen und Römern. Wiesbaden: 1889.

A short monograph which may be consulted advantageously for the opinions of the ancients on many of the Aristotelian canons of the epic. Here, among other notices, may be found brief summaries of the theory and practice of Eustathius, Aristarchus, Callimachus, Lycophron, Apollonius, Statius, Silius Italicus, etc.

ADDISON, J. Milton's Paradise Lost.

Spectator, Nos. 267, 273, 279, 285, 291, 297, 303, 309, 315, 321, 327, 333, 339, 345, 351, 357, 363, 369. For the best edition, see Cook, below. Compare also Hansen and Kabelmann, below, § 9, VII, C.

Most useful, not merely as a special criticism, but as affording a commentary on the function and nature of the epic in general, and a series of criteria which, though not always based upon sufficiently broad induction, are instructive and trustworthy within the classical field to which they apply. Addison follows Aristotle carefully, but admits (No. 273) that principles drawn from the practice of Homer cannot be expected to coincide perfectly with the practice of epics of other ages and environments. No. 417 contains a comparison of the imaginative powers of Homer, Virgil, and Milton; No. 523, an argument against the use of ancient mythology in modern poetry.

ALDEN, R. M. An Introduction to Poetry. N.Y.: 1909.

See above, § 2. Pp. 40–41 The Pastoral; 41–55 The Epic.

ARISTOTLE. Poetics (Wharton's Ed.).

III, 1; V, 4–5; VIII, 1–4; XVIII, 4–6; XXIII–XXVI.

Aristotle considers chiefly the following matters: the features common to epic and tragedy; unity of time and of action; the plot of the epic and the epic arrangement; the compass of the plot; the kinds of the epic, simple and complex, pathetic and ethical; the attitude of the poet toward his story; the degree to which the wonderful, the irrational, the dangerous, the impossible, the essential and the accidental, the ideal, the contradictory, may present themselves in the artistic epic; the relative excellence of epic and tragic poetry. Subjects for discussion are: Aristotle's statement that the compass of the epic should be confined to the joint length of the tragedies intended for one hearing (xxiv, 4); that tragedy is superior to the epic; also his problems and solutions. See notes in Pye and Twining. Butcher (Aristotle's Theory of Poetry and Fine Art, 4th ed. 1907) comments at length upon unity of action in tragedy and epic (p. 285 ff.). See also his note (p. 285): "In the Poetics the epic is treated chiefly from the point of view of the drama; in Dryden's dramatic criticism the converse holds true." — Compare M. Carroll, Aristotle's Poetics in the Light of the Homeric Scholia (Baltimore: 1895. Diss.).

ARMES, W. D. Old English Ballads and Folk Songs. N.Y.: 1904.

Introduction, pp. xi–xlv: an admirable brief survey of the characteristics of the ballad and theories of its origin.

ARNOLD, M. On Translating Homer. N.Y.: 1899.

These famous essays should be read in their entirety by every student of the epic. Arnold's immediate purpose is to point out the faults of previous translators of Homer, and also the right ends to be attained by future translators; but the essays contain in addition one of the most incisive characterizations of the literary art of Homer. As a basis for the study of the art of other epics, the student can find nothing more helpful. Arnold selects four characteristics of Homer's style, and then shows how the translators have failed or succeeded in conveying these characteristics in an English form.

> Homer is rapid in his movement, Homer is plain in his words and style, Homer is simple in his ideas, Homer is noble in his manner. Cowper renders him ill because he is slow in his movement, and elaborate in his style; Pope renders him ill because he is artificial both in his style and in his words; Chapman renders him ill because he is fantastic in his ideas; Mr. Newman renders him ill because he is odd in his words and ignoble in his manner (p. 200).

Newman's statement that the effect of Homer is quaint, garrulous, prosaic, low, and antiquated, is combated at length (171 ff.). In comparing the style of the ballad with that of Homer, Arnold makes the point that the ballad is plain, natural, and spirited, and in these respects resembles Homer; but that it lacks Homer's nobility and "grand style." Even Scott, the "coryphaeus of balladists," in striving after the "grand style," attains what can be called only a "bastard epic style" (195). As to the "grand style," it "arises in poetry, when a noble nature, poetically gifted, treats with simplicity or with severity a serious subject" (265). "The best model of the grand style simple is Homer; perhaps the best model of the grand style severe is Milton. But Dante is remarkable for affording admirable examples of both styles . . ." (266). — Compare T. S. Omond, Arnold and Homer, in vol. III (1912) of Essays and Studies by Members of the English Association, and articles on the 'grand style,' by G. Saintsbury and John Bailey in vols. I, II, III of the same series. For Newman's reply to Arnold, see F. W. Newman, Homeric Translation in Theory and Practice (Lond.: 1861). For a more minute criticism of a translation of Homer — a detailed criticism of the renderings of particular phrases and passages — see A. W. von Schlegel's Homers Werke von Johann Heinrich Voss (in Sämmtliche Werke. Ed. by E. Böcking. Leipz.: 1846 +; vol. X, pp. 115–193).

Arnold, M. Essays in Criticism. 2d Series. Lond.: 1888.

See essay on Wordsworth for the statement that the Greek "categories of epic, lyric, and so forth, have a natural propriety and should be adhered to." Compare Posnett, Comparative Literature, p. 41, Note.

Babbitt, I. The New Laokoon. An Essay on the Confusion of the Arts. Boston and N.Y.: 1910.

Although this work does not bear directly upon the epic (see its Index, however, under Homer and Mambrun), the student of epic criticism will find it a valuable help toward understanding the general spirit and fundamental principles of both neo-classical and romantic criticism.

Batteux, Charles, Abbé. Les beaux-arts réduits à un même principe. Paris: 1747.

Pp. 152–153, 199–218. Cf. above, § 2, and below, § 9, vi, c.

The epic is defined thus (pp. 200–201):

> Un récit en vers d'une action vraisemblable, héroïque, et merveilleuse. On trouve dans ce peu de mots, la différence de l'Épopée avec le Romanesque, qui est au-delà du vraisemblable; avec l'Histoire, qui ne va pas jusqu'au merveilleux; avec le Dramatique, qui n'est pas un récit; avec les autres petits Poëmes, dont les sujets ne sont pas héroïques.

The author continues with a discussion of the marvellous; on pp. 208–209 he takes issue with Le Bossu.

Baumgart, H. Handbuch der Poetik. Eine kritisch-historische Darstellung der Theorie der Dichtkunst. Stuttgart: 1887.

See Chap. V for the difference between epic and lyric: "Handlung als Gegenstand der Nachahmung das Kennzeichen der epischen, als Mittel derselben der lyrischen Gattung." Chaps. XV–XVIII discuss the epic at length, touching upon ethical quality and upon dignity of subject, and drawing comparisons between the epic and idyl, popular and artificial epics, romantic and comic epics.

Belsham, W. Essays, Philosophical, Historical, and Literary. 2 vols. Lond.: 1791.

Vol. II, pp. 275–303 On Epic Poetry.

An essay of great good sense, modelled on Voltaire (see below). The author realizes clearly and forcefully the value of inductive criticism, and appreciates Aristotle's principles of the epic accordingly. His strictures upon Le Bossu are to the point:

> It would be strange, if no general or interesting truth could be deduced from the narration of a great and memorable event; but, to make the Poem a mere vehicle for the communication of it, is to confound the plan of the Epopee, and to degrade it to a level with that of a fable of Aesop (p. 781).

He maintains further that a hero "favorisé du ciel, qui exécute un grand dessein en triomphant de tous les obstacles qui s'y opposent," is not a necessity in the epic, and that it would be absurd to deny Paradise Lost the title of epic because of such a mistaken idea. The necessity of supernatural machinery is also denied. The gifts of the epic poet are enumerated, and a series of brief notices of the principal epics, after the manner of Voltaire, closes the essay.

Benecke, E. F. M. Antimachus of Colophon, and the Position of Women in Greek Poetry. Lond.: 1896.

A fragmentary and unconvincing piece of work, but it throws a side-light upon Homeric characters. "A man living in a society in which women were despised, had to deal with legends belonging to an earlier social condition, in which women played a prominent part." — Compare W. C. Perry, The Women of Homer (Lond.: 1898).

BERNHARDY, G. Grundriss der griechischen Litteratur.

See above, § 2.

BLAIR, H. Lectures on Rhetoric and Belles Lettres. 3 vols. Edinb.: 1813. Orig. ed., 1783.

Vol. III, pp. 190–271.

Chapters covering the epic in general, — Homer, Virgil, Lucan, Tasso, Camoens, Fénelon, Voltaire, and Milton. Criticizes Le Bossu as frigid and absurd; defines epic broadly, as a "poetical recitation of great adventures"; the predominant tone of the epic is admiration, excited by heroic actions. Nature of subject, construction, the happy ending, the time-limit, characters, and machinery are also discussed. Aristotle is followed throughout.

BLANKENBURG, F. VON.

See below, under J. G. Sulzer.

BOILEAU-DESPRÉAUX, N. L'art poétique. Paris: 1674.

See pp. 91–109 of the Œuvres complètes (Paris: 1875); or pp. 188–220 of the edition by M. Amar (Paris: 1821). D. N. Smith's edition for the Pitt Press Series (Cambridge: 1898) is furnished with valuable notes, and also with introductory essays upon the criticism and doctrine of the Art Poétique, and its influence. For reprint, with translation by Sir William Sloane, see Cook's Art of Poetry; see also Batteux's Les quatre poétiques.

Satirical, and, like most other 'Poetics,' dogmatic, rather than inductive, in the statement of principles. The references to the epic are in the third canto (ll. 160–334). No definite theory of the epic is put forward; it is regarded loosely as "le vaste récit d'une longue action" (l. 161). Unlike Tasso, Boileau prefers pagan subjects to Christian. Formal rules take up most of the passage; but, in general, he supplements the position of the older classicists, who promulgated a set of rules on the authority merely of the ancients, by asserting broadly that these rules are grounded in 'nature' and 'reason.' In Boileau's answer to Perrault's attack upon the ancients, contained in Boileau's Réflexions critiques sur . . . Longin (Œuvres. 4 vols. Amsterdam: 1735; vol. III), will be found a defense of Homer and some attacks upon the modern French epic. See also the Satires and Epistles for matter bearing upon the epic. — Compare F. Brunetière, L'évolution des genres (3d ed. Paris: 1898; vol. I, pp. 15, 87–110); Esthétique de Boileau (in *Revue des Deux Mondes*, June 1, 1889); I. T. Myers (see below, § 11), pp. 21–22; A. S. Cook, Art of Poetry, p. xl. An informing work upon Boileau is that of G. Lanson, Boileau (Paris: 1892). See also A. Bourgoin, Les maîtres de la critique au XVII^e siècle (Paris: 1889), p. 129 ff.

Bradley, C. B. On the Distinction between the Art-Epic and the Folk-Epic. In *University of California Chronicle*, 8: 377–387.

The ultimate materials used both in the art epic and the folk epic are the same: myth, legend, and tradition. In both, moreover, the complete and final form is due to the skill of some individual poet and artist. The elements of difference, then, are: (1) the individual power and skill of the poet; (2) the essential character and the degree of elaboration of the popular materials as they come to the poet's hand; (3) the contemporary attitude of men regarding this material, as affecting the freedom the poet may allow himself in dealing with it; (4) our own knowledge or ignorance of the precise facts as regards these points, and of the conditions under which the poet worked — a subjective factor which unconsciously, but surely, affects our impression, and therefore our classification, of individual epics. The author shows that none of these differentiae, with the exception of the second, is a sure criterion of classification.

> The distinction then between the Folk-epic and the Art-epic so-called is a vanishing one, convenient indeed for certain purposes of education and criticism, and in typical cases apparent enough for such purposes; but too subjective, too impressionistic, too little based on fact and knowledge to be final (p. 387).

No student of the epic can afford to neglect this keen criticism of the distinction between the folk epic and the art epic; cf. Nettleship and Zimmermann, below.

Braitmaier, F. Geschichte der poetischen Theorie und Kritik von den Diskursen der Maler bis auf Lessing. 2 Thl. Frauenfeld: 1888–1889.

Valuable as summarizing the views upon literary types of Gottsched, Bodmer, Breitinger, the Schlegels, Mendelssohn, *et al.* See, especially, pp. 38–39, 185, 241, and Pt. I, Chap. IV. For criticism of the work, see O. F. Walzel, in *Anzeiger d. Zeitschrift für deutsches Alterthum*, 17: 55–74.

Brockhaus, F. A. Konversations-Lexikon. Berlin: 1893. Vol. VI, Art. Epos.

Bruchmann, K. Poetik. Naturlehre der Dichtung. Berlin: 1898.

Pp. 122–206. Note the following: 190, character of the age of the folk epic; 192, mixing of mythology and history; 195, material of epic; 196, character of the age of the art epic; 199, relation of epic to fairy-tales; 200, to beast-fables; 202, to romance; 205, to parody, idyl, ballad, etc. On the method of the book, see above, § 2.

Butcher, S. H. Aristotle's Theory of Poetry and Fine Art. 4th ed. Lond.: 1907.

"This book takes rank as the most complete apparatus in English for the study of Aristotle's Poetics." — In commenting upon Aristotle's views on character in tragedy, Butcher contrasts character in epic as follows:

> The action which springs out of character, and reflects character, alone satisfies the higher dramatic conditions. Here there is a marked difference between epic and dramatic poetry. The epic poem relates a great and complete action which attaches itself to the fortunes of a people, or to the destiny of mankind, and sums up the life of a period. The story and the deeds of those who pass across its wide canvas are linked with the larger movement of which the men themselves are but a part. The particular action rests upon forces outside itself. The hero

is swept into the tide of events. The hairbreadth escapes, the surprises, the episodes, the marvellous incidents of epic story, only partly depend upon the spontaneous energy of the hero. The tragic drama, on the other hand, represents the destiny of the individual man (p. 354).

See also above, under Aristotle.

CAMPBELL, L. Religion in Greek Literature. Lond.: 1898.

Chaps. III, IV Religion in Homer.

Notice the contention that a period of religious development intervened between the Iliad and the Odyssey; also the view that Homer takes his gods less seriously than his mortals (p. 76).

CARLYLE, THOMAS. Biography. In *Fraser's Mag.*, No. 27. 1832.

Carlyle, preaching the supreme poetic value of reality, takes occasion to inveigh against epic machinery. The instant myth ceases to be "authentically supernatural," ceases to command belief as in a reality, it is "in very deed mechanical, nowise inspired or poetical," and becomes a "miserable, meaningless Deception, kept-up by old use-and-wont alone." And since only the earliest epics can claim this "distinction of entire credibility, of Reality," all the rest are, in comparison, "frosty, artificial, heterogeneous things." A thesis which may well be tested in the light of fact and aesthetic theory. Compare Carlyle's own appreciation of the poetic truth of Shakespeare's characters (State of German Lit., 1827; in *Edinb. Rev.*, No. 92).

In his very readable article The Nibelungen Lied (1831; *Westminster Rev.*, No. 29), Carlyle presents an effective picture of the story of the great German epic, has something to say about the impression the poem has made upon him (as of life-large figures reduced to clear but elf-like miniatures), which he attributes partly to the fact that the poem was intended to be sung. He also utters some conventional criticism under the formal heads of Fable, Invention, Marvel, and Style. Of specific epic criticism there is next to nothing. See also The Hero as Poet: Dante, Shakespeare, in On Heroes, Hero-Worship, and the Heroic in History (1841).

Carriere, M. Die Poesie. Ihr Wesen und ihre Formen. 2d ed. Leipz.: 1884. 1st ed. 1854.

A most suggestive essay in philosophical (Hegelian) criticism. In pp. 193–367 the epic is treated systematically and comparatively. The epic hero is held to be representative of his race, and his story to be the revelation of the moral laws of the world-order. The epic is a microcosmos (Das Weltbild im Epos). The epic poet is always conscious of the divine law directing the actions of man, of his race-hero; and, thus, the epic reveals the supernatural in the moral world: "das Zusammenwerken des Göttlichen und Menschlichen bei allem Grossen in der Weltgeschichte ist die Idee welche Homer durch das Erscheinen seiner Götter und ihr Eingreifen in die Handlung sinnlich plastisch veranschaulicht" (p. 298). — On ballad and idyl see p. 310 ff. — Cf. the same author's Aesthetik (2 vols. Leipz.: 1885), vol. II, pp. 540–567.

Chambers, E. K. English Pastorals. N. Y.: 1895.

This charming collection is introduced by a brief but excellent critical essay, dealing with pastoral and idyl.

Child, F. J. English and Scottish Popular Ballads.
See below, § 11.

Cholmeley, R. J. The Idylls of Theocritus. Lond.: 1901.

Text, notes, etc. See the valuable introduction for a discussion of the relation of the poems of Theocritus to contemporary and older art and folk poetry. "Just as in the case of the epic idylls, and the pastorals, we find that Theocritus is not only a follower of a school among his contemporaries, but the exponent of that school in its purest form, so in the mimes we know of a contemporary rival" (p. 31).

Cintio, Giraldi. Scritti estetici di G. B. Giraldi Cintio. 2 vols. Milano: 1864 (in Daelli's Biblioteca Rara).

Vol. I, Discorso intorno al comporre dei Romanzi (written in 1549).

Cintio is important in the history of epic criticism because of his early formulation of the laws of the romantic epic, with its many actions and heroes. He based his induction upon Boiardo and Ariosto, just as Aristotle had based his laws for the epic of single action and a central hero upon his observation of Homer. On page 82 occurs a discussion of the propriety of mixing Christian and pagan mythology. Cintio's classification of the varieties of the epic as (1) the classical epic, in the Aristotelian sense, (2) the romantic epic of Boiardo and Ariosto, and (3) the biographical poem, is still noteworthy and suggestive. To the epic as to tragedy he ascribes the function of purgation of pity and fear, as did, also, his contemporary, Minturno (see below, § 9, V, A). Compare Spingarn, p. 112 ff. (1st ed.); Irene Myers (see below, § 11), p. 17; Saintsbury, Hist. of Crit., II, 58; F. Beneducci, Il Giraldi e l'epica nel Cinquecento (Bra: 1896).

CLARK, J. A History of Epic Poetry. Edinb.: 1900.

See below, § 11.

COLERIDGE, H. Essays and Marginalia. 2 vols. Lond.: 1851.

Vol. I, pp. 18–39 On the Poetical Use of the Heathen Mythology. Compare vol. II, pp. 26–28.

COLERIDGE, S. T. Seven Lectures on Shakespeare and Milton. 1856.

See also, on Milton, Lit. Remains, I, 169–178; Biog. Literaria, Chap. II; Table Talk, May 8, 1824, and Aug. 18, 1833; on Spenser, Lit. Remains, I, 89–97; Table Talk, June 24, 1827; on Homeric objectivity, Table Talk, May 12, 1830, cf. July 9, 1832.

Chiefly on poetic expressiveness.

COOK, A. S. The Art of Poetry. Boston: 1892.

A reprint of the poetical treatises of Horace, Vida, and Boileau, with the translations by Howes, Pitt, and Soames; and with notes and illustrative comments. The most convenient edition of these texts. For references to the epic, see under Vida, Boileau, in this section; under Horace, below, § 9, II.

Cook, A. S. Criticisms on Paradise Lost. Boston: 1892.

The best annotated reprint of Addison's papers on Paradise Lost. Professor Cook himself holds (p. xii) that the term 'epic' is a critical convention, and questions whether or not as a name of a poetical species it has any meaning apart from that convention. "If an opponent denies that the name is properly bestowed upon a composition which you call an epic, have you any recourse except to the statements of the literary historians and critics, your predecessors, who have given the name to works which you esteem similar?" Compare Croce below.

Couat, A. La poésie alexandrine. Paris: 1882.

Pp. 391–441 Idyls of Theocritus, — an attractive, sympathetic study.

Courthope, W. J. Life in Poetry: Law in Taste. Lond.: 1901.

See pp. 94–97 (Homer's universal genius *vs.* the picturesque talent of Apollonius; cf. (p. 102) the English epic) and 329–359 (Paradise Lost as an imitation of the universal in nature, of an age and the character of the age; as harmonizing opposite principles of art, etc.; pp. 343–347 contain a criticism of Macaulay's famous comparison of the styles of Dante and Milton).

Croce, B. Estetica, come scienza dell' espressione e linguistica generale. I Teoria; II Storia. Milano: 1902. 2d ed. 1904.

See pp. 38 ff., 454 ff., for a treatment of types in general, "in which the distinctions of literary kinds, and their historic evolution as a subject of study, are dismissed as wholly unreal and unscientific." Cf. the review in *The Nation* (N.Y.), 75: 252.

Dacier, Madame A. Des causes de la corruption du goust. Paris: 1714.

This work, a reply to Lamotte's strictures upon the Iliad, and the two following, which formed part of the "Ancient and Modern" quarrel, may be consulted for criticism of particular details in Homer. For further references concerning the quarrel, see Gayley and Scott, p. 435, and § 9, vi, b, c, below.

Dacier, Madame A. The Iliad of Homer, translated by Oldisworth and others. 2d ed. 5 vols. Lond.: 1714+. From the French, L'Iliade d'Homère, traduite en françois, avec des remarques. 1711. 1st ed. 1699.

The Preface is an example of the pseudo-classic moralistic interpretation of Homer (cf. below, § 9, vi, b, c). The author defends Homer against those who attack his fictions, by insisting upon the allegorical significance of the fictions; against those who find his manners and characters contemptible, by an argument for verisimilitude, and by parallel cases in Holy Writ; against those who balk at the improbable and marvellous, by pointing out the supernatural agency of these wonders. For an uncompromising statement of the moral purpose of the epic, see p. lvii.

Dacier, Madame A. L'Odyssée d'Homère, traduite en françois, avec des remarques. 3 vols. Paris: 1716. 1st ed. 1708.

For further notice of Madame Dacier, see below, § 9, vi, c.

In the Preface to this work the author fulfils a promise given at the close of the work above, by essaying a discourse upon the rules of the epic, and the application of those rules to La Calprenède's historical romance Cassandre, with a view to showing how far short of the Ancients the Moderns fall. The Preface is divided into four parts: (1) the nature and origin of epic poetry; its principles according to Aristotle and Horace; its purpose, wisdom, and utility; application to contemporary epic and romance to show how entirely lacking they are in true epic art; (2) defense of Homer against the Platonic objectors; (3) examination of Longinus on the Odyssey, and defense of the Odyssey as the equal of the Iliad in vigor and spirit; (4) encomiums of various kinds, but all with strong moralistic bent. The definition of epic is typical of the "age of reason": "un discours en vers, inventé pour former les mœurs par des instructions déguisées sous l'allégorie d'une action générale et des plus grands personnages" (p. xii). Saintsbury disposes of Mme. Dacier's criticism as "very aggressive, very erudite, and very unintelligent." Is this quite fair?

DAVENANT, SIR W. Works. Lond.: 1673.

Preface to Gondibert, pp. 1–27.

Important historically (first ed. 1650) in the development of English criticism of the epic, but otherwise negligible. For Hobbes' answer, see below. For Davenant's agreement with the conclusions of Tasso, see Spingarn, Crit. Essays, II, 332; for French influence on Davenant, see A. H. Upham, The French Influence in English Literature (N. Y.: 1908), pp. 387–389.

DIXON, W. M. English Epic and Heroic Poetry. Lond.: 1912.

For notice of this valuable work, see below, § 11.

Chap. I contains a discussion of the definition of the epic, already referred to above, § 7, I.

DOUMIC, R. Études sur la littérature française. 1ère Série. Paris: 1896.

See under Froissart for a popular discussion of the relations of epos and history.

DRYDEN, JOHN. Prose Works. Ed. by Edmund Malone. 4 vols. Lond.: 1800.

DRYDEN, JOHN. Works. Ed. by Scott-Saintsbury. 18 vols. Edinb.: 1882–1899.

References for the epic, in Malone, are as follows: I, Pt. II, 209 ff., Of Heroic Plays; I, Pt. II, 395, Pref. to State of Innocence; II, 154, Pref. to Albion and Albanius; II, 253 ff., An Account of the Poem entitled Annus Mirabilis, etc.; III, 66–69, Character of St. Evremont; III, 73 ff., esp. 91, 95, 99, 103, 115 ff., Discourse on the Original and Progress of Satire; III, 285–287, Dedication of the Third Miscellany; III, 309–316, 341–350, A Parallel of Poetry and Painting; III, 425–556, A Discourse on Epick Poetry; III, 598–602, Pref. to Fables, Ancient and Modern. — For aids to the study of Dryden, see below, § 9, VII, B.

Dryden, in the Discourse on Epick Poetry, takes considerable pains to prove that Aristotle's estimate of the relative excellence of epic and tragedy should be reversed. Says Dryden:

A heroic poem truly such is the greatest work of man; the epic portrays more of life than the tragedy, has more lasting ethical effect; displays more amply the nature of virtuous action, and more surely the dignity of character.

Compare with Aristotle's Poetics, chap. xxvi. Dryden interprets Aristotle as attributing greater nobility to the drama because of its more rapid action: but is not Aristotle speaking of the pleasantness rather than the nobility of the types? Note, p. 437 (Malone's ed.), the argument concerning the fitness of the marvellous and the colossal for the epic, and compare Aristotle xxiv, 8. Is Dryden's preference for simile over metaphor substantiated by the practice of great epic poets? For characteristics of epic, see pp. 426–490. Especially noteworthy is the dictum concerning the extent to which the epic poet may alter the facts of history. Dryden pays insufficient attention to the environment and period of the epic poet, but his essay, in spite of its borrowings from Segrais, is the first real contribution in English to epic criticism. For opinions contradictory to those expressed in the Discourse see III, 432, Twining's note; 437, and references there to 218, and I, 218; 311; 115 and note. A convenient edition of the Essays of John Dryden, with an introduction and commentary, has been arranged by W. P. Ker (2 vols. Oxford: 1900); consult pp. xv–xix, lxix–lxxi, and the commentary on the essays noted above.

Duchesne, J. Histoire des poëmes épiques français du XII^e^ siècle. Paris: 1870.

See below, § 11.

Egger, É. L'Hellénisme en France. 2 vols. Paris: 1869.

Vol. I, pp. 391–410 The growth of French criticism upon the epic; Chaps. XVI, XXVII The Pastoral.

Finsler, G. Homer in der Neuzeit, von Dante bis Goethe. Italien, Frankreich, England, Deutschland. Leipz. und Berlin: 1912.

For a complimentary review, see *Lit. Zentralbl.*, 1912, No. 19.

In this valuable and scholarly compendium the place of Homer in European culture from Dante to Goethe is indicated by a description of the general acquaintance with the Homeric poems, and of criticism, translation, and imitation of them, in Italy, France, the Netherlands, England, and Germany. Since the epic criticism of the period was concerned in very great part with Homer, it will readily be seen that this work goes a long way toward tracing the development of Renaissance and neo-classic epic theory and practice. A book of similar scope and industry on the place of Virgil (Comparetti's Virgil in the Middle Ages is of different scope) would admirably supplement the materials presented by Finsler. The method of treatment is primarily chronological under each national division, with indications, however, of important divisions according to matter. No student of the history of epic criticism can afford to neglect this work. If he uses it in connection with Quadrio and Blankenburg-Sulzer, he has excellent apparatus for pursuing such studies as are indicated in § 9, below (Outlines of Theory by Nationalities).

FISCHER, R. Zu den Kunstformen des mittelalterlichen Epos. Wien und Leipz.: 1899. In *Wiener Beiträge zur englischen Philologie*, Bd. IX.

A very methodical and minute analysis of Hartmann's Iwein, the Nibelungenlied, Boccaccio's Filostrato, Chaucer's Troylus and Cryseyde. The essay shows, somewhat "dishearteningly," what can be accomplished by applying the exact methods of science to literature. The aim of the author is to discover the principal 'art-forms' of the epic and to explain their functions. In the Introduction, the epic is held to be far more formless than the drama. The latter is likened to a watch in a glass case through which all the workings of the machinery can be seen; but the epic is rather like one in a gold case on the face of which can be seen only the outward signs of the hidden, moving powers underneath. Compare Aristotle, Dryden, Goethe and Schiller, Heinze, Humboldt, Ker, etc. The analysis of the 'art-forms' of the epic is as follows:

A. Subjective or ideal 'forms' (dealing with impressions of the reader).

1. Composition, by phases of ideal independence ("ideelle Selbständigkeit"), viz., exposition, moment of excitation, confusion, crisis, unravelling, and solution.
2. Construction, by a series of pictures or scenes which make up the whole.

B. Material 'forms.'

1. Epic 'form,' in which the author, with his indirect narrative, stands between the action and the reader.
2. Dramatic 'form,' — i.e. direct action.
   (*a*) Monologue, dialogue, etc.
   (*b*) Technique of characters.

Now, inasmuch as the 'art-forms' are the immediate expression of the spiritual contents, and inasmuch as the relation between form and content is not a dead symmetry but a living harmony, it follows that the material forms are symptomatic of the spiritual contents. Thus, the 'forms' will fully decide the literary type, as epic, for instance.

FOURNEL, V. Le Virgile travesti . . . par Paul Scarron, précédé d'une étude sur le burlesque par Victor Fournel. Paris: 1858.

Of interest as bearing upon the burlesque epic.

FREYBE, A. Klopstock's Abschiedsrede über die epische Poesie. Halle: 1868.

Klopstock's essay was a youthful and somewhat feverish appreciation of the epic, especially of its religious aspect. The future author of the Messias naturally gave his highest praise to Paradise Lost, which he ranked above the Iliad. Summary in Frick and Polack (below, § 11), and in Klopstock's Werke, ed. R. Hamel, vol. I, pp. xxxviii–xl (Kürschner's Deut. National-Litt., vol. 46).

FRIEDEMANN, K. Die Rolle des Erzählers in der Epik. In *Untersuch. z. neueren Sprach- und Litgesch.*, N.F., No. 9. 1910.

A hasty and otherwise inadequate treatment of a big subject, — the technique of narrative.

Gartelmann, H. Dramatik. Berlin: 1892.

The object of the drama is to represent characters by means of action, of epic to represent action by means of characters. Cf. Ker on dramatic representation of characters in epic and on characterization in epic and romance (*op. cit. infra*).

Gayley, C. M. The Principles of Poetry.

See above, § 2. Pp. xcii–xcvii Poetry of Recital: Ballad, Hero-Saga, Gest, Epic, etc.; quoted above, § 7, 1. Pp. ci–cii Idyl and Pastoral.

Gayley, C. M., and Scott, F. N. An Introduction to the Methods and Materials of Literary Criticism.

See above, § 2.

Giner, F. Estudios de Literatura y Arte. Madrid: 1876.

Pp. 65–81 De la Poesía Épica, y en Particular, de la Epopeya. Cf. pp. 47–64.

Gladstone, W. E. Studies on Homer and the Homeric Age. 3 vols. Oxford: 1858.

Vol. III, pp. 500–545. Section V Homer and some of his successors in epic poetry, in particular Virgil and Tasso.

The author, comparing Milton (p. 500), Dante (p. 502), Virgil (pp. 502–532), and Tasso (pp. 534–545) with Homer, furnishes suggestions which will materially assist in an inductive study of the essentials of the epic. Note particularly the theories arrived at with regard to the natural or the supernatural as the sphere of the epic, the human or the extra-human in characterization, the ethical or the artistic in purpose, the influence of the age upon the quality of the work, the atmosphere of religious simplicity and faith investing the events narrated (510–512), the choice of subject, individual or national, actual or fanciful (535–540), the blending of fatalism and free-will (529–535). A valuable reference.

Glover, T. R. Studies in Virgil. Lond.: 1904.

A series of sympathetic lectures covering the literary influences, national relation, and interpretation of Virgil. The conclusion is that Virgil's was the "voice of hope and gladness in the Roman world." For two other famous essays on Virgil, see Green and Myers, as cited below.

GOETHE and SCHILLER, Correspondence between. Trans. by L. Dora Schmitz. 2 vols. Lond.: 1877–1879. (Bohn's Lib.)

The detached remarks upon the epic are of great value. They should be traced through the entire correspondence; but the most important notices lie near together, in the following letters: Nos. 300, 305, 306, 399, 429, 636 (Goethe); and 301, 303, 304, 311, 400, 402, 428, 498 (Schiller). Letter 399 should be studied in particular. It contains a formulation, by Goethe, of his and Schiller's ideas about the epic and drama. Here occurs Goethe's suggestive statement that, "if any one wished to deduce the details of these laws (i.e. of the epic and the drama) from the nature of man, he would need always to keep before his mind a rhapsodist and a mimic, both as poets, the former surrounded by his circle of silent listeners, the latter by his eager and observant spectators, and it would not be very difficult to discover what it was most appropriate for each of the two species of poetry to do, what subjects each chiefly selects, and what motives they chiefly make use of; I say chiefly, for, as I said above, neither of them can assume anything exclusively to itself." Both epic and tragedy, he observes, are subject to general laws, particularly to the law of unity and development; they employ similar subjects and all sorts of motives; they contemplate the physical, the moral, and the fanciful; at the best, epic and tragedy deal with characters who possess independence of action; they differ in that the epic presents events as past, the drama as present; the opposition in the epic is objective and external, and requires breadth of treatment, but tragedy deals more subjectively with its characters and so requires a less extensive stage; epic is calm in its appeal, contemplative of past events, but drama is immediate, personal, compelling in its effect; etc. Compare Harnack and Hartung, below; also the notice of Goethe in § 9, VIII, B.

Gosse, Edmund. Articles, Epic Poetry, Idyl. In Encyc. Brit., 11th ed.

Gosse, Edmund. An Essay on English Pastoral Poetry. In A. B. Grosart's ed. of Spenser, vol. III. Lond.: 1882.

See also the "Rider" by Grosart.

A charming and valuable essay.

Gottschall, R. Poetik, etc.

See above, § 2. Vol. II, pp. 97–190 Die epische Dichtung.

Gottschall, after a pre-prandial on the character of epic poetry, attacks omnivorously the larder of poetic narrative in general: folk-epic, art-epic (historical, romantic, religious, comic), poetic story (epical; didactic-epical, — fable and parable; lyric-epical), romance and tale (historical romance, contemporary romance, fairy-story, *novella*), and didactic poem (epigram, learned poem, satire, epistle). — For ballad, see pp. 48–52.

Gravina, G. Prose di Gianvincenzo Gravina. Firenze: 1857.

Della Ragion Poetica, pp. 6–32, 44–51, 66–68; for Italian epic, pp. 88–135.

Green, J. R. Stray Studies from England and Italy. N. Y.: 1876.

Pp. 227–253 Aeneas: A Virgilian Study.

One of the most sympathetic studies of the Aeneid ever written. Comparison will show that Gladstone's depreciatory utterance upon the same subject is an underestimate. Professor Green unfolds the nature of the ethical, purposeful, national epic. For him the Aeneid is no song of Aeneas, but of Rome; not of her past, but of her future; of the self-mastery, the submission, the divine order, the subordination of temporal desires to eternal purposes. It is the national epic of Stoicism, ideal manhood, endurance, piety: but through all is heard the footfall of the Fates.

Greg, W. W. Pastoral Poetry and Pastoral Drama. Lond.: 1906.

This extensive and authoritative study of Elizabethan pastoral drama is of prime value to the student of pastoral poetry. Note the helpful bibliography, pp. 444–448.

Grote, G. History of Greece.

See below, § 11.

Gummere, F. B. A Handbook of Poetics. 3d ed. Boston: 1898.

Pp. 7–39 The Epic. Pp. 29–30; 80–81 Pastoral and Idyl. For the ballad, see The Beginnings of Poetry, by the same author, as listed above, § 5, and below, § 11; also other works noted in § 11.

Gurteen, S. H. The Epic of the Fall of Man. A Comparative Study of Caedmon, Dante and Milton. N.Y. and Lond.: 1896.

The "comparative study" consists of a weak, appreciative comparison of parallel passages in Caedmon and Milton, with some reference to Dante. The task is superficially conceived and lightly undertaken. The like may be said also of the same author's Arthurian Epic (N.Y.: 1895), which is more historical in method, but popular and untrustworthy.

Hallam, H. Introduction to the Literature of Europe. 7th ed. 4 vols. Lond.: 1864.

Vol. IV, pp. 235–243.

An enthusiastic laudation of Paradise Lost. Hallam believes that Milton's subject is the grandest ever chosen for heroic poetry, that the unity of the poem is more complete than that of the Iliad or the Aeneid, and that the subject is of greater interest than Tasso's. But he falls foul of theology and machines.

Hamilton, C. Methods and Materials of Fiction. N.Y.: 1908.

Pp. 153–160.

A contrast of epic and novel in respect of social scope and individualization of character. Is it true that in epic the characters are "not adjudged as individuals, apart from the conflict in which they figure"? What of ballad-like interest in epic characters?

Hardie, W. R. Lectures on Classical Subjects. Lond.: 1903.

Lect. V The Vein of Romance in Greek and Roman Literature: on the relation of Alexandrian romance and idyl to their environment; cf. pp. 270–271.

Harnack, O. Die klassische Aesthetik der Deutschen. Würdigung der kunsttheoretischen Arbeiten Schiller's, Goethe's und ihrer Freunde. Leipz.: 1892.

Harnack desired to extend the work of Heinrich von Stein, who traced the history of aesthetic theory to Lessing and Winckelmann. His book is valuable for its convenient exposition of the ideas of Goethe, Schiller, and their friends regarding literary types as judged by theories of art as a whole. For a summary and discussion of Schiller's opinions concerning the relative rank of epic and tragedy, see pp. 93–95. His verdict in favor of tragedy, because of its greater problems and difficulties, is held by Harnack to be a logical result of Schiller's "play-theory." Goethe's attitude, and his preference for the epic, are found on pp. 125–128. Compare Humboldt on Hermann und Dorothea, treated by Harnack pp. 141–153.

Hart, W. M. Ballad and Epic.
See below, § 11.

A scholarly investigation of the scope and technique of the simple ballad, the border ballad, the gest and heroic ballad, and the epic.

Hart, W. M. English Popular Ballads. Chicago: 1916.
See below, § 11.

Hartmann, E. von. Ausgewählte Werke. 2d ed. Leipz.: n.d.
Bd. IV Zweiter systemat. Theil der Aesthetik, pp. 714–732 On the Epic. See also pp. 732–733, on the lyrical epic; and pp. 758–761, on the epical drama. For Hartmann's classification of poetry, see the notice in Gayley and Scott, § 20.

The division of the epic into plastic, or pure epical, epic, and picturesque, or lyric, epic, rests upon a differentiation of plastic and picturesque (*malerische*) art (see pp. 634–642). Much more importance than that of fanciful resemblance attaches to the author's parallels between the lack of background, the typical subject (god and hero), absence of subjective color, etc., which he finds to be characteristic of sculpture, and the corresponding traits of the natural epic. To what extent may these parallels, and those between painting and the picturesque, or artificial, epic, be explained as necessary effects of similar social and intellectual conditions manifesting themselves in different media? On the Idyl, see Bd. III, p. 439 ff.

HARTUNG, J. A. Lehren der Alten über die Dichtkunst durch Zusammenstellung mit denen der besten Neueren. Hamburg und Gotha: 1845.

A valuable and convenient little book of reference. Ancient and modern parallels and extensions of Aristotle's dicta are arranged side by side with the corresponding passages of the Poetics. Of the ancients, Horace, Longinus, and Plutarch are most often cited; Lessing, Goethe, Schiller, and Humboldt of the moderns. For the epic, see pp. 225–264.

HEGEL, G. W. F. Vorlesungen über die Aesthetik. Werke. 18 vols. Berlin: 1833–48.

Bd. X, Abt. III, pp. 326–396. See also J. S. Kedney, Hegel's Aesthetics, A Critical Exposition (Chicago: 1885), pp. 278–281.

Hegel traces the epic from the germ to be found in the epigram or gnome, through the ancient Greek elegy, the philosophical epic (of Xenophanes and Parmenides), the cosmogonies, etc., to the epos proper. But is there anything of an epic nature in the epigram, or in the didactic cosmogony? Is not human action requisite to the unity of the epic? The definition of the epic proper (Kedney p. 278, Hegel pp. 331, 332, 340) is one of the most suggestive that the student can find. Notice the emphasis laid upon "the life of a nation or the history of an epoch and the totality of the beliefs of a people" as the realm of subject-matter. But do not this definition and the statement concerning the period best adapted to epic composition rule out the literary epic? Can the epic that deals with an age of which we have no sympathetic understanding fulfil the requirements of "absolute" poetry? — "Complex relations are unsuitable to the epic." What shall we say, then, of the theological problems involved in Paradise Lost? — "The connection of man with nature should be primitive." Apply to the Divine Comedy. — Hegel makes destiny in the epic a result of exterior forces; but does not the idea of destiny vary with the age in which the poet lives? — Discuss his remarks upon the idyl and the "epic of the Bourgeoisie." — For a still more highly philosophical view of the epic, see Hegel's Die Phänomenologie des Geistes (1807), — English trans. by J. B. Baillie, vol. II, p. 738 ff.

HEINZE, R. Virgils epische Technik. Leipz.: 1903.

A decidedly informing treatise. The author is concerned, not with general and abstract questions of epic criticism, but with the aesthetic exposition of a particular epic. He analyzes the Aeneid into its various parts, displaying the composition of each part, and the composition of the whole; then, gathering the results together, seeks to present a systematic view of epic technique under the heads: method of creation, invention, representation (narration, description, speeches), composition, aims. — For further discussion of this subject, see H. T. Plüss, below.

HENDERSON, T. F. The Ballad in Literature. Cambridge: 1912.

An excellent compendium. For the form, character, sources, and themes of the ballad, and its peculiarities as lyric-epic and as related to epic proper, see Chaps. I and II.

HEPPLE, N. Lyrical Forms in English. Cambridge: 1911.

See remarks upon idyl and pastoral.

HERDER, J. G. Sämmtliche Werke. Ed. by B. Suphan. 32 vols. Berlin: 1877–99.

Bd. III, pp. 195–272. See also the article, Herder on the Epic, in *Blackwood*, 42: 734–744. For a more extended notice of Herder, see below, § 11.

The article in *Blackwood* will furnish the student with a fair *résumé* of Herder's theory. He treats of the epos as a living tradition, of its requisites and characteristics and its historical development, of the difference between epic poetry and history, and of Aristotle's dicta concerning the relative excellence of epic and tragedy. Especially worthy of consideration are the following statements: that successive picturing and imagery of language are vital to the epic (pp. 738–739); that in it the weightiest events depend upon accidents beyond man's control; that the epos disappears as belief in celestial interposition wanes; and that (p. 741) the epos and history "flee the one from the other." "The epos must arise in new splendor": does this prophecy refer to the revival of interest in the old epic, or to the birth of some modern type of epic? Consider the validity of the assertion, "Epos has a wider compass and a deeper foundation than tragedy." Cf. Aristotle, Dryden, Addison, Pope, Schiller, Goethe, etc.

HILLARD, G. S. The Relation of the Poet to his Age. Boston: 1843 (Harvard ΦBK Lecture).

Pp. 26–32 Some remarks upon the relation of the epic poet to his subject-matter.

HILLEBRAND, J. Aesthetica Literaria Antiqua Classica, etc. Moguntiae: 1828.

A rather inadequate collection of critical *loci* from the ancients upon the art of literature. § 48 Epic; 49 Pastoral; 46 Lyric; 43 Tragedy; 44 Comedy.

HINNEBERG, PAUL (ed.). Die Kultur der Gegenwart. Thl. I, Abt. VIII Die griechische und lateinische Literatur und Sprache. See above, § 5.

See index for notices by von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, Krumbacher, etc., under Epos, Eidyllia, Erzählung, Fabel, Rhapsoden, and names of epic and idyllic poets. See other volumes of the same series for brief accounts of oriental and other occidental literatures.

Hirn, Yrjö. The Origins of Art. A Psychological and Sociological Inquiry. Lond.: 1900.

In this informing and most suggestive study of the nature, origin, and development of the art-impulse the seeker after the fundamental, original qualities of poetic narrative will find much help. In Chap. VII, Deduction of Art Forms, Hirn shows the relation of descriptive and "what in the widest use of the term we may call an epic" purpose to the fundamental impulse "to secure a faithful response to an overmastering feeling." The beginnings of such 'epical' presentations among the lower races are noted in Chap. XII Historical Art.

Hobbes, T. The English Works of Thomas Hobbes. Ed. by Sir William Molesworth. 10 vols. Lond.: 1839–44.

Vol. IV, pp. 443–458 The Answer to Sir William Davenant's Preface before Gondibert.

To the student of theory the Answer is of value only as a document in the history of English criticism. Hobbes' conception of the epic appears in this astonishing statement: "The . . . figure of an epic poem, and of a tragedy, ought to be the same: for they differ no more but in that they are pronounced by one, or many persons" (444). The greater part of the essay is taken up with praise of Davenant's poem. See also Hobbes' Preface to his translation of Homer — To the Reader Concerning the Virtues of an Heroic Poem — where the seven virtues of the epic are stated as follows: choice of words, construction, contrivance of the story or fiction, elevation of the fancy, justice and impartiality of the poet, clearness of description, amplitude of the subject (vol. X, pp. iii–x).

Hudson, W. H. An Introduction to the Study of Literature. 2d ed. Lond.: 1913.

Pp. 134–145 Objective Poetry.

A brief treatment of the ballad, the epic of growth, the epic of art, the metrical romance, realistic poetic narrative.

HUMBOLDT, W. VON. Gesammelte Schriften. 12 vols. in 15. Berlin: 1903–1912.

Bd. II, pp. 115–319 Ueber Goethe's Hermann und Dorothea. For a discussion of Humboldt's theories in relation to the Wolfian hypothesis, see K. Fortmüller, Die Theorie des Epos bei den Brüdern Schlegel, den Klassikern und W. von Humboldt (Progr. Wien: 1903).

Perhaps the most admirable of German theories of the epic advanced during the eighteenth century. The inquiry is based upon the peculiar impression produced by the Hermann und Dorothea; and upon an attempt to differentiate the kinds of poetry according to their relations to certain types of emotional and imaginative creation and appeal. The method of approach is, therefore, psychological. After a consideration of the distinctive emotional type out of which the epic evolves and which, also, it expresses to the reader, the epic poem is defined as: "... eine solche dichterische Darstellung einer Handlung durch Erzählung ..., welche (nicht bestimmt einseitig eine gewisse Empfindung zu erregen) unser Gemüth in den Zustand der lebendigsten und allgemeinsten sinnlichen Betrachtung versetzt (§ lxii)." The six laws of the epopee with which Humboldt concludes are simple and commend themselves to the attention. They require concreteness of presentation, continuity of development, uniformity of poetic purpose, tranquillity of atmosphere, a broad (or universal) outlook, and normal or probable rather than historic truth (Gesetze der höchsten Sinnlichkeit, durchgängiger Stetigkeit, der Einheit, des Gleichgewichts, der Totalität, und pragmatischer Wahrheit). The comparison of Homer and Ariosto (§§ xxi–xxvi) is suggestive and inspiring. Compare Schiller's letter to Humboldt, criticizing the essay, June 27, 1798 (Schiller's Briefe. Ed. by F. Jonas, 7 vols. Leipz. etc.: 1892–1896. Vol. V, pp. 392–398).

HUNT, L. What is Poetry? Ed. by A. S. Cook. Boston: 1893.

Pp. 64–69 An answer to the question: Which class of poetry is the highest? Hunt votes for the epic but doubts whether this class has included the greatest poet.

HUSTVEDT, S. B. Ballad Criticism in Scandinavia and Great Britain during the 18th Century. N.Y.: 1916.

"A survey of the development of the interest in popular ballads, showing the importance of such ballads in inspiring great creative writing in recent times and throwing light on international relationships."

JOHNSON, C. F. Forms of English Poetry. N.Y.: 1904.
Pp. 325–356.

A book for beginners.

JOHNSON, SAMUEL. Works. 9 vols. Oxford: 1825.
Vol. III, p. 125 ff. Life of Milton.

Johnson maintains that Milton, and Milton alone, followed the rules laid down by Le Bossu as a recipe for an epic poem. Could anything worse be said of an epic poet? For Johnson's formal criticism of Milton's prosody, see *The Rambler*, Nos. 86, 88, 90; on Spenser, No. 121. — For Johnson on the pastoral and idyl, see *The Adventurer*, No. 92, Criticism on the Pastorals of Virgil; *The Rambler*, Nos. 36, 37, Reason why Pastorals Delight, True Principles of Pastoral Poetry.

JORDAN, W. Epische Briefe. Frankfurt am Main: 1876.

Superficial. Under Part II, Chap. II, is a brief exposition of the folk and saga conditions deemed prerequisite to the development of an epic. Chap. III differentiates epic poetry and epos, and limits the latter by natural and national boundaries to the Hindus, Persians, Greeks, and Germans. Notice the following upon the relation between individual myths (and hero-stories) and the epos: "Erreicht aber sind die Eigenschaften des Epos erst dann, wenn auf dem Hintergrunde solcher Göttersage ein geschlossenes Drama der Heldensage die Schicksale und die Weltanschauung eines Culturvolkes spiegelt" (p. 43). To such a stage, he avers, the Kalevala has not attained. The fourth letter considers the material of the epic; the remaining letters deal with particular epics.

JORDAN, W. Das Kunstgesetz Homers und die Rhapsodik.
Frankfurt a. M.: 1896.

A sketchy discussion of Homer's art as that of the 'scop' or 'rhapsodist.'

KEBLE, J. Lectures on Poetry.
See above, § 2.

Scattered through these charming lectures are many forceful, some trenchant, criticisms of epic art, especially that of Virgil. See the Index under Achilles, Aeneid, Dante, Epics, Heroic Age, Homer, Iliad, Milton, Odyssey, Spenser, Ulysses, Virgil, etc.

KEDNEY, J. S. Hegel's Aesthetics.
See above, under Hegel.

KER, W. P. Epic and Romance. Lond.: 1897.

These essays, descriptive of "some of the principal forms of narrative literature in the Middle Ages," contain the most solid and original contribution in English to epic criticism. They are equally valuable on the theoretical and historical sides. The Introduction differentiates in descriptive fashion the heroic age of medieval literature from the later romantic epoch; theorizes a bit upon the relations of epic and romance, and upon the relation of both to mythology; and introduces the subjects of the first four chapters: Teutonic Epic, Icelandic Sagas, and the Old French Epic. — In Chap. I, § 1, the author seeks to establish the claim to the title of epic for the Beowulf, Nibelungenlied, Chansons de Geste, Icelandic Sagas, etc., both by proving a similarity of social conditions in, and environment of, these poems and the Homeric poems, and also by showing a similar growth in form. Are not these criteria fundamental and sufficient? The characteristic growth of the epic is held to be a progress "out of the older and commoner forms of poetry, hymns, dirges or panegyrics . . ., towards intellectual and imaginative freedom" (p. 15). This growth is distinctly present at the beginning of the history of the modern nations, but has generally been thwarted and left incomplete. — In § 2 the author holds that dramatic presentation of character is of prime and characteristic importance in the epic. The Northern epics possess the "epic quality of drama" (23), and they do not realize the historical meaning and importance of the events with which they deal. The epic poet is free in the conduct of his story (23–27). It is the power of national glory — not mere history — that passes into the freehand character-delineation of the epic and is realized there in a heroism and lofty spirit which were themselves the product of historical events (28–30). Romance is not the opposite, though a danger, to epic; it is an ingredient of epic (34–38). — In § 3 the author treats of the interruption, by classical and Christian influences, of the medieval epic's independent development of romantic mythology; in § 4, the relations in general of medieval epic and romance. — Chap. II considers the Teutonic epic as follows: that it conforms to the Aristotelian canon in its dramatic realization of plot, from which, and not from a psychological interest in the ἤθη, the interest arises (§ 1); that the Teutonic epics are not on the Homeric scale, but that they are too independent to be regarded as pre-epic lays out of which a great epic might have been "cobbled" (attack upon the composite theory, pp. 139–141) (§ 2); that they are similar in scale to ballad-poetry, but unlike the ballad are ambitious, self-conscious, aristocratic, accomplished, and the possessors of an unballadlike interest in character (§ 3); the style of the poems (§ 4); that the poems developed very well without the interference of "contaminating editors," progressing "by a free and natural growth into a variety of forms, through the ambitions and experiments of poets" (§ 5); Beowulf as an epic (§ 6). — Chapters III and IV are concerned with the Icelandic Sagas and the Old French Epic respectively; Chap. V, with Romance and the Old French Romantic Schools.

KLEINPAUL, E. Poetik. 8th ed. 3 pts. Leipz.: 1879–80.
Pt. III, pp. 105–185.

Under the head of Epische Poesie the author classifies everything in narrative style, from the fable and the allegory to the romance and the tale. Pp. 121–169 treat more especially of the development and character of the epos. By way of the legend and the saga, the idyl, the ballad, and metrical romance, Kleinpaul approaches the epic. This he subdivides as epopee, national epic, romantic epic, lesser historical epic, epic of country and town, religious epic, and mock-heroic epic. The numerous references to German literature are of special value. Kleinpaul, like most Germans, ranks the Hermann und Dorothea among the epics. Compare Humboldt, as noted above.

LACOMBE, P. Introduction à l'histoire littéraire. Paris: 1898. Pp. 7 ff., 314 ff.

A discussion of the relative superiority of the literary types.

LANG, A. Theocritus, Bion, and Moschus. Rendered into English Prose, with an Introductory Essay. Lond.: 1880. Also in Golden Treasury Series.

To the student who does not read Greek these admirable translations offer the best introduction to the study of Theocritus and the Theocritean idyl. The sympathetic and often penetrative introduction places too great emphasis, perhaps, upon the indebtedness of Theocritus to folk-poetry. Compare the review in *Berl. phil. Wochenschr.*, 1893, 776; also G. Knaack's criticism in Art. Bukolik, Pauly-Wissowa, Real-Encyc. (1899).

LANG, A. Art. Ballads, Encyc. Brit., 11th ed.

LANGE, K. Das Wesen der Kunst. 2d ed. Berlin: 1907.

A book on a much wider subject than the epic, but valuable for its psychological and aesthetic orientation of the epic as one of the subdivisions of art. The point of departure of the book is the illusion implicated in all art. Epic and history are, accordingly, differentiated (pp. 70–72). To history illusion is only a dispensable means of vividly imparting truth to others; but for the epic-poet illusion is the essential end of his work. Cf. p. 185. For the illusion of epic-marvels, see pp. 340, 621–622.

Le Bossu, R. P. Traité du poëme épique. Paris: 1675.

English translations: W. J., Monsieur Bossu's Treatise of the Epic Poem, etc. 2d ed. London: 1719; General View of the Epic Poem . . . Extracted from Bossu, prefixed to Pope's transl. of the Odyssey, Chalmers' English Poets, 19: 158–166.

It is easy to say that this treatise is antiquated, that it deals with altogether too limited a collection of epics, and consequently presents nothing that to the critic of to-day will seem new, suggestive, or profitable. But to the due understanding of certain theories of the epic, Le Bossu's Traité is not only a direct but delightful guide. Nor should its influence on Dennis, Addison, Pope, and Johnson be overlooked. In Book I of the Traité, Chap. III, Définition du Poëme Épique (in spite of the actual definition), and Chaps. XIV and XV, Des Actions Véritables et Feintes, are full of common sense. In Book II, the chapters De l'Unité de l'Action and Du Nœud et du Dénouement should be read; in Book III, De l'Admirable et des Passions; in Book IV, Chap. V, Des Mœurs de l'Héros; and in Book V, Des Machines. Le Bossu's serious, topsy-turvy recipe for the making of an epic poem is almost more absurd than Pope's famous mock-recipe (Art of Sinking in Poetry, Chap. XV); yet it gives the key to the Renaissance idea of the moral purpose and moral self-consciousness of the epic and epic-poet. Le Bossu's definition is found in the English translation, Book I, Chap. III: "The Epopea is a Discourse invented by Art, to form the Manners by such instructions as are disguised under the Allegories of some one important Action, which is related in Verse, after a probable, diverting, and surprising Manner." In order to achieve this remarkable product, Le Bossu advises the poet first to catch a moral, then let it simmer into action, then season with appropriate characters (Bk. I, Chaps. VI, VII; Bk. II, Chap. I). Compare Voltaire's Criticism of Le Bossu (p. 371 of work cited below); *Spectator*, No. 369; Saintsbury, Hist. of Crit., vol. II, p. 315.

LILLY, M. L. The Georgic. A Contribution to the Study of the Vergilian Type of Didactic Poetry. Diss., Johns Hopkins Univ. Baltimore: 1917.

Chap. III. The Relation of the Georgic to the Pastoral.

LOHRE, H. Von Percy zum Wunderhorn. Beiträge zur Geschichte der Volksliedforschung in Deutschland. In *Palaestra*, No. 22. 1902.

LOISE, F. Histoire de la poésie, etc. Bruxelles: 1887.

For notice, see under § 11.

LOTZE, H. Geschichte der Aesthetik in Deutschland. München: 1868. Eng. transl. by G. T. Ladd, Outlines of Aesthetics. Boston: 1886.

Pp. 619–643 of the German ed. Das Epos und der Roman (review of Humboldt, Schelling, etc.). Pp. 93–98 of the transl. Nature of the Epic.

Lotze discusses the epic as a member of the first species of poetry, — the narrative, "which preserves a careless disposition, seeking only an elevating expression of the mind." But *is* the narrative the first, or earliest, species of poetry? He next depicts the Greek mode of apprehending the world, and, emphasizing the Greek joy in objectivity, the Greek earthliness, simplicity, and religiousness, draws therefrom the characteristics of the Greek epic. Examine his contrast between epic and dramatic unity, and his dicta concerning the peaceful nature of the catastrophe, the simplicity of the characters, the stately leisure of the epic, the evident motivation. Review finally the comparison between the epic and the romance.

MACAULAY, T. B. Milton. In *Edinburgh Rev.*, Aug. 1825.

A comparison, more facile than convincing (see Courthope, as cited above), of Milton and Dante, especially as regards style and the use of machinery. Compare the essay on Dante, in *Knight's Quarterly Mag.*, Jan. 1824.

MACKAIL, J. W. Lectures on Poetry. Lond.: 1911.

Pp. 72–92 The Aeneid; 123–153 Arabian Epic and Romantic Poetry; 154–178 The Divine Comedy.

The first reference sketches "the circumstances in which the Aeneid was created . . ., its quality as a work of art, and as an expression and interpretation of life," — a forceful and enthusiastic introduction to the Aeneid, which the student should not neglect. The second reference discusses an "inchoate Arabian epic," and contains valuable suggestions in respect of the absence of the epic in Arabian poetry and the influence of the latter upon medieval romantic poetry. In the essay on the Divine Comedy two questions are considered: Why did Dante call his poem a Comedy? and "in what sense is that name rationally or poetically applicable to it"? Valuable information as to the state of critical knowledge in the time of Dante concerning the epic and dramatic types is contained in this chapter.

MAMBRUN, P. Dissertatio Peripatetica de Epico Carmine. Paris: 1652.

For summary, see Blankenburg-Sulzer (noted above), vol. II, p. 9.

Thoroughly Aristotelian, but supporting the interesting proposition that a woman may be a heroine of tragedy, but not of epic. What does such a doctrine suggest as to the social presupposition of the epic, — as compared with that of medieval romance or the novel? Cf. Chapelain's La Pucelle, as noted below, § 9, VI, B.

MARSH, A. R. Epic Poetry. In the Universal Cyclopaedia. N. Y.: 1900.

See below, § 11.

MEIER, J. Werden und Leben des Volksepos. Halle a. S.: 1909.

See below, § 11.

MILLER, G. M. Dramatic Element in the Popular Ballad.

See below, § 11.

MONGE, L. DE. Études morales et littéraires. 2 vols. Paris and Bruxelles: 1887, 1889.

A discussion of the moral values in the epics and romances of chivalry. The poems that come under discussion are as follows: Nibelungenlied, Roland, Cid, Romances of the Table-Round, Orlando Furioso, Amadis, etc.

MOULTON, R. G. Biblical Idyls. N. Y.: 1905.

See the critical introduction for a discussion of the idyl. In subject the idyl is homely rather than heroic; in form it may be of many kinds, but it is characteristically brief. See also a chapter on the lyric idyl in the same author's Lit. Study of the Bible (Boston: 1896).

MOULTON, R. G. The Modern Study of Literature. 1915.

See reference to this work, above, § 2.

For an analysis of the plots of the Iliad and the Odyssey, see pp. 136–143; on types of narrative plot, 144; on relation of epical narrative to short-story and novel, 152–161.

MÜLLER, E. Geschichte der Theorie der Kunst bei den Alten. 2 Bde. Breslau: 1834–37.

Minute and exhaustive. Frequent reference is to be found in Gayley and Scott.

MÜLLER, K. O. A History of the Literature of Ancient Greece to the Period of Isocrates. Transl. by G. C. Lewis. Lond.: 1847.

Chap. XXI, p. 285.

The difference between epic and dramatic poetry. The formal and the spiritual distinctions considered. The question resolved into one of the mental and emotional attitude of the poet toward his subject.

MYERS, F. W. H. Virgil. In Essays, Classical. 1883.

"The most famous English essay on Virgil," — aesthetic, historical, speculative, but bearing only indirectly upon epic theory.

Myers, Irene. A Study in Epic Development.

See below, § 11.

Neilson, W. A. Essentials of Poetry.

See above, § 2.

Nessler, K. Geschichte der Ballade Chevy Chase. In *Palaestra*, No. 112. 1911.

Nettleship, H. Lectures and Essays on Subjects Connected with Latin Literature and Scholarship. Oxford: 1885.

Pp. 97–142 Suggestions introductory to the study of the Aeneid.

Professor Nettleship attributes to literary epics the following characteristics: (1) disproportion of the epic framework to the indwelling idea; (2) superabundance of detail, but lack of primitive simplicity; (3) disregard of the realities of nature for the sake of literary effect; (4) vague or dim realization of the hero's character; (5) lack of the poetic element of personal interest; (6) attempt to atone by impressiveness of idea for ungraceful execution; (7) inability on the part of the subject (although it may impose upon the imagination) to stimulate the invention; (8) a present idealized with the halo of the past; (9) a reflection of a multitude of contemporary beliefs; (10) a note of universality which in the heroic epic was unknown. It would be profitable to test by such criticisms the Paradise Lost, the Divine Comedy, Sigurd the Volsung, the Earthly Paradise, the Epic of Hades, the Light of Asia, the Epic of Saul, and other modern epics. Cf. Bradley, above.

Olrik, A. Epische Gesetze der Volksdichtung. In *Zeitschr. für deut. Altertum*, 51: 1–12.

On laws of composition common to epic, *Märchen*, and saga. These laws are named as follows: "das Gesetz des Einganges und Abschlusses, die Wiederholung, die Dreizahl, die szenische Zweiheit, das Gesetz des Gegensatzes, das Zwillingsgesetz, das Achtergewicht, die Einstrengigkeit, die Schematisierung, die Plastik, die Logik der Saga, die Einheit der Handlung, die Konzentration um die Hauptperson."

PANZER, F.

See below, § 11.

PARIS, G., and MEYER, P. Histoire poétique de Charlemagne. Paris: 1905.

The Introduction treats, in part, and with extreme clarity and simplicity, of the origin, elements, and form of epic poetry and of the epos in general. The relations of early lyric and epic poetry are briefly sketched, and the epos is considered under four essential divisions: facts, idea, character, form. The facts and characters are furnished by national tradition. The idea is national, religious, and moral; but the individuality of the poet may leave its mark upon the poem by the proportional importance assigned to these aspects of the idea. The form, determined by previous poetry, allows the poet liberty to manifest himself further in the talent with which he perfects the form. The facts may be historical or mythical, but mythical to the modern critic only. The myth-epic was historical in its original intention and reception. The national idea displays itself in three ways: in a choice of tales which honor the nation; in a poetical realization of the aspirations of the nation; and in a glorification of the nation above other peoples and a corresponding humiliation of its enemies. — The epic will also represent one or the other of two great social or political tendencies always present in national life, — the aristocratic and democratic tendencies. — The religious idea is very closely associated with the national, and lends sanctity and profundity to it. The moral idea is present, as an idea of justice, in the subject and *dénouement* of the epic, and also in the conception of human life — its problems and experiences. This conception of life is national rather than individual. — The characters are: gods or other superior beings, kings and chiefs, women, the people, and the enemy. Their rôles and the method of their presentation vary with different poems and nations. At the head of the *personnel* stands the hero, whose character sums up all the ideas and inspirations of the epic, and further imprints them upon the nation itself. — It is impossible to generalize upon the form of the epic, because of the great variety of nations, languages, and poetic talents. The authors mention only two uniform characteristics: the repetition of identical formulas in identical situations, and the perpetual use of dialogue. These are interpreted psychologically (p. 9). — The remainder of the Introduction is concerned with the application of these generalizations to the French Épopée.

Few short *résumés* of epic theory are of more value than this. For a critique of the first edition (1865), see P. Meyer, Recherches sur l'épopée française (Paris: 1867).

Pigna, G. I Romanzi. Venice: 1554.

Cintio, Pigna, Castelvetro, and Patrizzi — all of the sixteenth century — unite in entering an early protest against the application of the Aristotelian principles of the epic to the romantic epics of the Renaissance. They perceived the historical anomaly involved in such a procedure, and attempted an induction of new epic principles from a study of Boiardo and Ariosto. See Spingarn, 1st ed., pp 112–116, 163–166.

Plüss, H. T. Virgil und die epische Kunst. Leipz.: 1884.

See above, R. Heinze.

Posnett, H. M. Comparative Literature. N. Y.: 1896.

Pp. 41–44.

An argument against the *a priori* conception of the epic as a universal type. Pp. 158–159, beginnings of the epic. For pastoral and idyl, see pp. 240, 257–259. See also the same title under § 11, below; and, for general critique, Gayley and Scott, §§ 2 and 17.

Quadrio, F. S. Della storia e della ragione d' ogni poesia. 7 vols. Bologna e Milano: 1739–1752.

Cf. above, § 2.

The fourth volume (about 800 pages) is taken up for the most part with the consideration of didactic and contemplative poetry, which is classified under the general head of epic poetry. Paradise Lost is considered as a didactic epic, p. 285. The romances of chivalry are considered in pp. 289–607. The epic proper, or heroic poem, as it is called, is treated rather briefly, in comparison with the treatment of less important types (pp. 608–711). The usual recipes for epic construction are collected in pp. 608–645. Pp. 646–711 contain a dictionary of writers of heroic poems. For the idyl see vol. II, pt. 2, pp. 349–361. With Quadrio the student may compare the learned work of L. A. Muratori, Della perfetta poesia italiana (2 vols. Modena: 1706).

RABB, KATE M. National Epics. Chicago: 1896.

Summaries, specimens, and brief bibliographies of the chief epics: intended as an introduction for those without the leisure to read and study the poems in their entirety. A similar work is H. A. Guerber's The Book of the Epic (Philadelphia: 1913), — the epics summarized in prose; also C. M. Gayley's Classic Myths in English Literature and in Art (rev. ed. Boston: 1911), pp. 277–431: outlines of Iliad, Odyssey, Aeneid, Volsunga Saga, Nibelungenlied; pp. 450–465, records of more important national epics.

RAJNA, PIO. Le origine dell' epopea francese. Firenze: 1884.
See below, § 11.

RAPIN, R. The Whole Critical Works of Monsieur Rapin (with Preface to second vol. by Rymer). 2 vols. 2d ed. Lond.: 1716.

Vol. I Comparison of Homer and Virgil; vol. II Reflections on Aristotle's Treatise of Poesie. The first is an essay of the old enthusiastic fashion, based lavishly upon Aristotle, but it affords quaint reading for the student of to-day (cf. the reproach of Nausicaa for lack of decorum in "too far Indulging her own Curiosity at the Sight of a Person in such desperate Circumstances"; or the commendation of Virgil's heroes because they quarreled "like Persons of Quality"). The second is scarcely more than a repetition and illustration of Aristotle's principles; but in it occurs (pp. 201–204) a "run" of short estimates of modern epics, — all very "neat and narrow-minded." Rapin, like many other Renaissance critics, believed that the end of the epic was to teach rather than to delight, and he subordinated genius to rules and interdicts. Homer and Virgil, in spite of certain shortcomings which he notes, he regards as the supreme poets.

RAYMOND, G. L. Poetry as a Representative Art. N.Y.: 1886.

Chap. XXII contains an analysis of Homer's methods of natural description: mental, fragmentary, specific, typical, progressive. See also the same author's Representative Significance of Form (2d ed., N.Y.: 1909), Chaps. XVIII ff., on the epic, realistic and dramatic.

RIGAULT, H. Histoire de la querelle des anciens et des modernes. Paris: 1856.

A careful and thoroughly readable account of the great "Ancient and Modern" confusion. It may be consulted for the attitude of the following toward the matters in dispute: Sir William Temple, Saint-Évremond, Wotton, Dryden, Boyle, Bentley, Swift, Tasso, Boisrobert, Saint-Sorlin, Bouhours, Fontenelle, the Perraults, Dacier, Ménage, Francius, Longepierre, de Callières, Huet, Bayle, Boileau, Arnauld, Tourreil, Regnier, de la Motte, Fénelon, Saint-Hyacinthe, l'abbé de Pons, Cartaud de la Vilate, Gacon, Hardouin, l'abbé d'Aubignac, l'abbé Terrason, Buffier, Fourmont, Pope, Wiseman, Vico.

Rigault summarizes the quarrel in three parts: the philosophical question of progress, the literary comparison of the ancients and moderns in general, *the dispute concerning Homer.*

ROCAFORT, J. Les doctrines littéraires de l'Encyclopédie, etc.

See above, § 2.

SAINTE-BEUVE, C. A. Étude sur Virgile suivi d'une étude sur Quintus de Smyrne. 4^e éd. Paris: 1891.

§ I Relation of the culture of the epic poet to that of his heroes; II The chantre épique and the poëte épique; VI On the priority of the epic over other types; VII On the epic unity of time as one year. — Other references to Sainte-Beuve may be found above, § 2.

Sainte-Beuve supplements Arnold's view that the poet should take his subject from the past, by showing that the treatment of the past is not incompatible with an approximation in spirit, at least, to the conditions of vivid contemporary life, — "une vie réelle à sa date et parmi les contemporains, et non pas une vie froide pour quelques amateurs dans le cabinet" (p. 73).

> Pour un poëme épique, tout sujet qui présente une belle, une noble et humaine matière, une riche tradition, peut être bon à traiter; l'éloignement même ne s'oppose en rien à l'intérêt, et, bien loin de nuire, peut servir l'imagination du poëte en lui laissant plus de carrière. Reculez donc tant que vous le voudrez et élargissez l'horizon; remontez aux antiquités, aux origines; reprenez même en partie des sujets déjà traités par d'autres: mais que, par quelque endroit essentiel, par quelque courant principal de l'inspiration, il y ait nouveauté, et application, *appropriation* des choses passées au temps présent, à l'âge du monde où vous êtes venu, et à ce qui est de nature à intéresser d'une manière élevée le plus d'esprits et d'âmes: le vrai et vivant succès est à ce prix. — Vivez au moins une première fois, c'est la première condition pour vivre toujours (p. 82).

SAINT-ÉVREMOND, C. DE M. DE SAINT-DENIS, SEIGNEUR DE. Œuvres mêlées de S.-É. 3 vols. Paris: 1865.

See vol. II, pp. 492–502, Sur les poëmes des anciens, for comment upon the influence of Christianity in changing the characters and manners of epic-heroes. — Pp. 503–510, Du merveilleux qui se trouve dans les poëmes des anciens, provide a comparison of the marvels of the ancients with those of the romancers. The ideas of Saint-Sorlin and Perrault should be compared with these of Saint-Évremond. See Rigault. See also F. Pastrello, Étude sur Saint-Évremond et son influence (Trieste: 1875), which will inform the student in regard to the general critical attitude and authority of Saint-Évremond. Compare W. M. Daniels, Saint-Évremond en Angleterre (Versailles: 1907).

SAINTSBURY, G. A History of Criticism, etc.

See above, § 2.

SANTAYANA, G. Interpretations of Poetry and Religion. Lond.: 1900.

Though not dealing directly with the epic, this treatise contains much by way of suggestion for the student of the aesthetic and ethical functions of the epic.

SCALIGER, J. C. Poetices Libri Septem. 4th ed. In Bibliopolio Commeliniano: 1607. (1st ed. Lyons: 1561.)

Lib. I, Cap. XLI Epic. Lib. V Comparisons between Homer and Virgil, etc. For the astonishing statement that not the Iliad but the Odyssey is tragic, see Lib. I, Cap. V.

Important only in the history of criticism. Compare F. M. Padelford's Select Translations from Scaliger's Poetics (Yale Studies in English, vol. XXVI, pp. 54, 73. N. Y.: 1905); E. Lintilhac, De J. C. Scaligeri Poetice (Paris: 1887); G. Saintsbury, History of Criticism, vol. II, p. 77; and Irene Myers, p. 16, who says that Scaliger's doctrine by which not nature but the classics are set up for imitation — in which he went a step beyond Vida — had an important effect upon the general theory of the epic. See J. E. Spingarn, Critical Essays of the 17th Century, vol. I, p. xxiv, for an English attack of the seventeenth century upon Scaliger's criticism of Homer. Scaliger's work is the summation of the criticism of the sixteenth century. A French writer has wittily said of him:

> Quand il entre plus au fond des choses, Scaliger est purement disciple d'Aristote. Il ne s'en distingue qu'en deux points: Quand Aristote est profond, il ne peut le suivre jusqu'au bout; quand Aristote est étroit, il est plus étroit qu'Aristote (Faguet, Trag. fr. XVI^e siècle, p. 45).

But Scaliger's familiarity with Aristotle's Poetics is questioned. Spingarn says his conception of the epic is Horatian and that he evinces little or no acquaintance with the Aristotelian doctrine (Lit. Crit. in the Ren., 111, 185–186).

SCHELLING, F. W. J. VON. Sämmtliche Werke. Stuttgart: 1856–61.

Abt. I, Bd. V Philosophie der Kunst, pp. 645–687.

Schelling's theory of the epic is cast in metaphysical terms, and can be fully understood only in the light of his philosophy; but several canons of epic theory are enunciated with clarity and logical support. What he has to say about the absence of the element of the wonderful in Homer (pp. 654, 670 ff.), and of the mistake of the moderns in imitating the supposed wonders of the Iliad, merits attention. The more important statements of principle may be indicated as follows: in the epic the infinite and the finite are one, and, consequently, there is no display of the infinite in the epic, not because it is not there, but because it rests in a common unity with the finite; there is no lyric opposition of freedom and necessity, no tragic representation of a struggle against fate; the epic itself is indifferent to time — rests in quiet above time — although it embraces in its narrative a long chain of causes and effects, of becomings and changes; the epic describes great and little events, significant and insignificant circumstances, with equal circumstantiality, for the poet deals quietly and impartially, absolutely as it were, with the events, great and little, of his unhurried, absolute world; the poet is not oppressed by the fortunes he narrates, — Achilles weeps and storms, but the poet appears neither touched nor untouched by the hero's passions; "endlich fasst sich alles darin zusammen, dass die Poesie oder der Dichter über allem wie ein höheres, von nichts angerührtes Wesen schwebe." Other subjects treated are: the material of the epic and its relation to mythology; Virgil and Homer in comparison; the sub-species of epic (elegy, idyl, didactic poem, satire); the romantic epic; the Divina Commedia as a type by itself.

SCHILLER, J. C. F. The Aesthetical and Philosophical Essays. Trans. from the German. Being vol. VIII of the Cambridge Edition of Schiller's Works. Boston: 1884.

Pp. 269–338 On Simple and Sentimental Poetry. Compare Gayley and Scott, p. 337.

Is the naïve character of Schiller's "simple" poetry the equivalent of epic objectivity? — Compare the citation under Goethe, above; also J. A. Hartung; Carriere, pp. 297–299; Myers, p. 30; Bosanquet, Hist. of Aesthetic, 2d ed., p. 298; below, § 9, VIII, B.

SCHLEGEL, A. W. VON. Sämmtliche Werke. Ed. by E. Böcking. 12 vols. Leipz.: 1846 ff.

Vol. XI, pp. 183–221 Goethes Hermann und Dorothea.

Schlegel, in his attempt to state the principles of the epic in a fresh and unconventional manner, shows his usual rebellion against the school of Boileau.

SCHLEGEL, F. VON. The Aesthetic and Miscellaneous Works of Schlegel. Trans. by E. J. Millington. Bohn's Lib. Lond.: 1849.

Part II, p. 224 ff. Contributions in Aid of the Study of Romantic Poetry.

In this essay occurs (p. 235) the often quoted statement that Camoens' Lusiad is "the only national epic poem that has been produced in modern times, even if the last period of ancient literature be included."

SCHOPENHAUER, A. The World as Will and as Idea. Trans. by Haldane and Kemp. 3 vols. Lond.: 1883.

Vol. I, pp. 321, 324, 325, 413.

Note the evolution of grades in the poetic representation of the idea of man. If we assume as basis of differentiation the more or less intense manifestation of the poet's personality, shall we class the epic midway between lyric and drama, as subjective-objective? Examine Schopenhauer's hierarchy of Ballad, Idyl, Romantic Poem, etc. Compare Schopenhauer's distinction between poetry and history with Aristotle's (p. 325). Does Schopenhauer's requirement of significant characters and situations adequately distinguish epic from history? "A genuine and enduring happiness cannot be the subject of art" (p. 413): test this aphorism by application to the epic, the drama, the idyl. Vol. III, p. 211 Do most epics introduce to us their characters in a state of peace? Do most dramas? What do such considerations teach us regarding the tone of the epic?

SELLAR, W. Y. The Roman Poets of the Augustan Age. Virgil. Oxford: 1877.
Pp. 277–413.

In Chap. VIII Sellar considers the Roman epic before the time of Virgil, and reviewing the conditions and characteristics of the literary epic, distinguishes it from the primitive type. Like Professor Jebb (§ 11, below) he finds an analogy between the literary epic and the histories of Livy and Gibbon. In Chaps. IX and X the author's admiration for the Aeneid is as unreserved as that of J. R. Green, save in one particular: "the idea of the Aeneid regarded from its religious, political and personal side is one which does not touch the heart or enlighten the conscience" (p. 349)! To what extent is this a drawback common to other literary epics? The statements that the Aeneid represents the deeper tendencies of the poet's age, that it is a new kind of epic (national), that it fulfils a double purpose — reawakens the heroic life and glorifies thereby the new Rome (294–320) — should be considered in their applicability to other literary epics. On the atmosphere of predestination prevalent in the Aeneid as compared with Paradise Lost and the Divine Comedy, see Chap. X.

SHAIRP, J. C. Aspects of Poetry. Boston: 1882.
Chap. VI Virgil as a Religious Poet; Chap. XIII The Homeric Spirit in Walter Scott.

In the second reference, after differentiating the literary and the popular epic, Shairp goes on to show that Scott, as a result of environment and natural endowment, expressed himself poetically in an epic fashion similar to that of Homer.

SHELLEY, P. B. A Defense of Poetry (1821). Ed. by A. S. Cook. Boston: 1891. Also in Works. Ed. by H. B. Forman. 8 vols. Lond.: 1880. Vol. VII, pp. 99–144.

Pp. 11–15 (Cook's ed.) celebrate the universality of Homer's characters and the ethics of his art. Epic truth (pp. 29–33) lies in the fullness with which the epic represents the knowledge, sentiment, and religion of its age and of "the ages which followed it, developing itself in correspondence with their development." "Homer was the first and Dante the second epic poet: that is, the second poet, the series of whose creations bore a defined and intelligible relation to the knowledge and sentiment and religion of the age in which he lived, and of the ages which followed it." On this criterion, see J. A. Symonds, The Study of Dante (4th ed. Lond.: 1906), pp. 96–99.

SIDGWICK, F. Popular Ballads of the Olden Time. 1903.

SPIELHAGEN, F. Die epische Poesie und Goethe. In *Goethe-Jahrbuch*, 16: 1–29 (1895).

Spielhagen contends that the novel is the modern development of the epic.

SPIELHAGEN, F. Neue Beiträge zur Theorie und Technik der Epik und Dramatik. Leipz.: 1898.

See under § 11, where the work, in spite of its title, more properly belongs.

SPINGARN, J. E. A History of Literary Criticism in the Renaissance. N.Y.: 1899. 2d ed. 1908.

For references, see above, § 7, I, B.

An extremely valuable work as a guide in a little-explored field. See below, § 9, *passim*, for further notices of this book.

STEDMAN, E. C. The Nature and Elements of Poetry. Boston: 1892.

References to the epic, ballad, idyl, etc. may be traced by means of the index. In Chaps. III and IV (Creation and Self-Expression; Melancholia), the pagan and Christian eras of poetry are distinguished, respectively, as objective and subjective. Contrasting the two, the author finds in the ancient, pagan world, "first, a willing self-effacement as against the distinction of individuality; secondly, the simple zest of art-creation, as against the luxury of human feeling — a sense that nourishes the flame of consolation and proffers sympathy even as it craves it" (pp. 139–140). The Homeric epic is cited as an example of the "antique zest, the animal happiness, the naïveté of blessed children" (pp. 94–97; cf. pp. 143, 176). Firdawsī is introduced thus:

> To produce an epic deliberately that would simulate the primitive mould and manner, in spite of a subjective, almost modern, spirit, seems to have been the privilege of an Oriental, and, from our point of view, half-barbaric race (p. 111).

Of Dante:

> His epic, then, while dramatically creative, is at the apex of subjective poetry, doubly so from its expression of both the man and the time; hence our chief example of the mixed type, — that which is compounded of egoism and inventive imagination. Its throes are those of a transition from absolute art to the sympathetic method of the new day (pp. 113–114).

Milton: pp. 115–118. Compare Gayley and Scott, p. 342. — For a complaint that modern English poetry has "rounded a beautiful but too prolonged idyllic period," see p. 275; cf. pp. 68, 69, 87, 193, 225, for other mention of the idyl; also the same author's Victorian Poets (rev. ed. Boston: 1887 +), Chap. V Tennyson, VIII Subject Continued: minor idyllic poets, and other passages which can be traced by means of the index.

STEINTHAL, H. Das Epos.

See below, § 11.

SULZER, J. G. Allgemeine Theorie der schönen Künste, etc.

See above, § 2, where Blankenburg's Zusätze are also noted. All references to Blankenburg-Sulzer, or Blankenburg, are to these Zusätze. Vol. II (2d ed. of Sulzer), pp. 494–568 Heldengedicht. For the comic epic, see vol. IV, Art. Scherzhaft.

After an insistence upon the necessity of deriving the principles of the epic from the results of comparative and historical research, there follows a long and valuable bibliography of ancient epics, their translations into modern tongues, and the cognate critical treatises up to 1790. With page 511 begins the consideration of modern epic poems, and here the bibliography is surprisingly full and painstaking. The methodical and exhaustive student will find these bibliographies of great assistance in the study of the earlier periods. See also the articles Dichtkunst (Poesie, Poetik), Episode, Handlung; also the articles on ballad, pastoral, eclogue, idyl; and under the names of epic, pastoral, and idyllic poets.

SUTTERMEISTER, O. Leitfaden der Poetik für den Schul- und Selbst-Unterricht. 2d ed. Zürich: 1874.

A convenient, though old-fashioned, handbook. Pp. 47–59 contain a careful division of epics into minor kinds, with convenient citations of cases. The divisions are as follows: Symbolic, including allegory, fable, parable; Historical and Fabulous, including poetic narrative, idyl, saga and *Märchen*, legend, ballad, epos, romance, novel.

SYMONDS, J. A. Introduction to the Study of Dante. 1872.

SYMONDS, J. A. Renaissance in Italy. 7 vols. N.Y.: 1879 +.

See Pt. II of the Catholic Reaction, Chaps. VII, VIII, for Tasso; Chap. XI, for Marino's Adone and Tassoni's mock-heroic Secchia Rapita; Pt. I of Italian Literature, Chap. I, for Chansons de Geste; Chap. II, for Dante and Petrarch; Chap. VII, for Pulci and Boiardo; Chaps. VIII, IX, for Ariosto.

SYMONDS, J. A. Studies of the Greek Poets. 2 vols. N.Y.: 1880. 1st ed. 1873–1876.

Chapters I–V contain interesting material, mostly appreciative, on early Greek history and mythology, and Homer and Hesiod. On the impersonality of the epic poet, the character of Achilles, and the women of Homer, the author dwells at some length. The chapter on the Idyllists contains much of interest and suggestion, with an insistence upon the variety of form (epic, lyric, dramatic) and identity of method (the pictorial) of the idyl.

TASSO, T. Discorsi dell' arte poetica, ed in particolare sopra il poema eroico; written about 1564. Original ed. 1587. In C. Guasti, Prose diverse di T. T. 2 vols. Firenze: 1875.

TASSO, T. Discorsi del poema eroico. In vol. III of Opere di T. T. 5 vols. Milano: 1823–25. 1st ed. 1594.

Compare Sulzer, *op. cit.*, vol. II, p. 505; or Blankenburg-Sulzer, vol. II, p. 9; see, also, Spingarn, 1st ed., pp. 119–124.

Tasso's object in both essays is to harmonize the character of the romantic epic with Aristotle's principles. In his Poetics he endeavors to reconcile classic and romantic epic-unity; he holds that the subject of the epic should be chosen from Christian history, avoiding at once the contemporary and a past so remote as to appear strange in manners and customs; he defends Christian marvels, in preference to pagan, believes the epic need not arouse pity and fear, and recommends the presentation of a Christian hero of exalted virtue. In the Discourse on the Heroic Poem the epic is defined as an "imitazione d' azione illustre, grande e perfetta, fatta, narrando con altissimo verso, a fine di muovere gli animi colla maraviglia, e di giovare in questa guisa" (Lib. I, p. 24). Epic material must possess "l' autorità dell' istoria, la verità della religione, la licenza del fingere, la qualità de' tempi accomodati e la grandezza degli avvenimenti" (Lib. II, pp. 83–84). Lib. III considers the forming of the material into the fable, and is strongly Aristotelian. The differences between romance and epic are considered, and it is asserted that both imitate the same objects, with the same instruments, and after the same fashion. Further, on romantic unity in variety, characters, thought, etc. The last three books consider under the head of diction the matter of adornment. On page 204 it is affirmed that the style of epic is not far from the gravity of tragedy or the grace of lyric, and is in advance of both in splendor and marvellous majesty.

The student should also consult the Lettere Poetiche (vol. III), and the Discorsi delle differenze poetiche (vol. V). These four studies, taken together, constitute one of the most famous utterances in the history of epic criticism, and were the occasion of endless discussion by the "Ancients and Moderns." Cf. Rigault.

Ulrici, H. Geschichte der hellenischen Dichtkunst. 2 Thle. Berlin: 1835.

Aside from the historical criticism one should notice the theoretical generalizations of Chap. IV, Pt. I, Wesen und Idee der epischen Poesie in ihrem Gegensatze zur lyrischen und dramatischen Dichtung überhaupt und nach den Kunstbegriffen der Griechen insbesondere. Distinguishing between lyric and epic as respectively subjective and objective, he concludes that epic stands on the periphery of human life and "leitet von da aus die Bewegungen nach innen": whereas the lyric moves from the center outward. (Is this good psychology?) Both, he continues, extend themselves mutually, and stand to each other in the relation of the 'World' and the 'I.' By their nature, then, both kinds must have coexisted from the beginning, although the objective character of primitive life would bring the epic to an earlier fruition. The two kinds, as expressions of two sides of consciousness, will continually, after their separation in the beginnings of development, seek their union again in consciousness. The product of this longing for union is the drama. (But does the history of the drama bear out any such theory?)

Ulrici, H. Shakespeare's Dramatic Art. Trans. by Dora Schmitz. Bohn's Lib. 2 vols. Lond.: 1876.

Vol. I, pp. 324–326.

Note Ulrici's contention that the epic is the poetry of the past. "It describes the human mind not so much from the inner side — but from the side and in the form in which it advances out of subjectivity." What light does this passage throw upon the difference between the epic and the dramatic spirit? upon the relation of will to action in the epic? upon the "haze of distance that envelops the epic hero"? upon the ideal and typical character of epic individuals? If the deeds and sufferings of epic individuals are due to direct divine ordinance and the individuals are aware of the fact, is the civilization of the twentieth century capable of producing an epic proper? Ulrici holds, also, that the epic is invariably the poetry of nature, and that it originates in the first stage of mental development. Does the first stage of artistic expression coincide with the first stage of mental development?

VIDA, M. H. Opera. Leyden: 1541.

Pp. 213–274 De Arte Poetica. Reprinted, with trans. into French prose, by Batteux (see §.2); also, with Christopher Pitt's English trans., by A. S. Cook (Art of Poetry). For summary, see Batteux, II, 3–4; Cook, xxxv; Irene Myers, 15; Saintsbury, Hist. Crit., 2d ed., II, 30–33.

Bk. II deals with invention and disposition of material, especially in the epic. But the criticism is purely formal, and deals with minutiae of composition, rather than with general theory. The book amounts to the practice of Virgil reduced to a set of rules. After Vida, epic theory plays an increasingly important rôle in Italian criticism.

VIEHOFF, H. Die Poetik auf der Grundlage der Erfahrungsseelenlehre. Trier: 1888.

P. 494 ff.

A convenient discussion of the relative importance of plot and character.

VINCENT, ABBÉ C. Théorie des genres littéraires.

See above, § 2.

VISCHER, F. T. Aesthetik oder Wissenschaft des Schönen. 3 vols. Reutlingen-Stuttgart: 1846–57.

Bd. III, Abschn. 2, Hft. 5, pp. 1265–1321, 1324 ff., 1348, 1376, 1389; 1289–1291, 1317–1321 Idyl; 1358–1367 Ballad; 1292–1300 Epical romances.

Vischer and Carriere should be studied with Hegel, whose followers they are.

Voltaire, F. M. A. de. Essai sur la poésie épique. In Œuvres complètes de Voltaire. 66 vols. Paris: 1819–25.

> Vol. VIII, p. 346 ff. The student should compare the original form of this essay (1727–28) with the revision of 1733. Some important additions, showing the influence of Dubos, may be noticed in the latter. See F. D. White, Voltaire's Essay on Epic Poetry (Bryn Mawr Diss., 1915).

Voltaire brought common sense back into French criticism of the epic. He subjects the Renaissance school of criticism, with its endless and barren rules for the proper inditing of epics, to the criticism invited by its own extremes and repetitions. He ridicules the dead weight of useless regulations contrived by the graceless critic who has "discouru avec pesanteur de ce qu'il fallait sentir avec transport"; asserts that Homer, Virgil, and Milton obeyed each his own genius: that therefore it is fallacious to encumber great authors with rules drawn from the practice of others, and that those who lack genius are but feebly aided by such preachments. Moreover, says he, most of the critics have derived their rules from Homer. But Homer composed two poems of absolutely different nature. Consequently, the critics are at great labor to harmonize Homer. Virgil unites the features of the Iliad and Odyssey in his work: more harmonizing for the critics! The conventional Renaissance definition of the epic ("Le poëme épique est une longue fable inventée pour enseigner une vérité morale, et dans laquelle un héros achève quelque grande action, avec les secours des dieux, dans l'espace d'une année") is exploded by showing it will not fit Paradise Lost; and Voltaire adds that it is impossible to define works of the imagination, which are always changing with time and race, as one defines metals, animals, and the like, the natures of which always remain the same. An induction for the epic must be based upon wider material than Homer and Virgil. On pages 358–359 he proposes a comparative view of all epics.

In his article on the Épopée, in the Dictionnaire Philosophique (vol. XXXV, pp. 414–453), Voltaire's taste is not the equal of his common sense in the Essai. He rates Virgil above Homer, praises the moral exhortations with which Ariosto opens his cantos, and is not without misgiving and difficulty when praising certain excellences in that "singular poem," Paradise Lost.

Wackernagel, W. Poetik, Rhetorik und Stilistik. 3d ed. Halle a. S.: 1906.

For notice, see § 11.

Wasson, D. A. Epic Philosophy. In *No. Am.*, 107: 501–542.

An article evidently inspired by Hegel's reconciliation of opposites. Note Wasson's statement of the characteristics of the epic: pp. 523, 525, 545, — the style of invocation, the breadth of subject, the contest of the "all-comprehending" with its opposite, the insignificance of finite suffering as set over against the invulnerable character of the soul.

Watts-Dunton, W. T. Poetry. In Encyc. Brit. 11th ed.

For a general review, see Gayley and Scott, § 20.

For the comparative clearness of vision possessed by Homer, Dante, and Milton, see the earlier part of the essay. Epic and drama are discussed in respect of dialogue and of exigencies of plot. The notice of the dramatic quality of the Iliad should be carefully considered; also, Watts-Dunton's distinction between the epics of growth (Mahâbhârata, Niblung story) and the epics of art (Odyssey, Aeneid, Paradise Lost, etc.); and between the epics of eastern and western peoples: the former characterized by natural flow of story, persistence of artistic motive, and a temper of resignation; the latter, with one or two exceptions, by nebulosity of motive, disturbance of narrative unity, and a Titanic temper — the temper of revolt against authority (at its best in the Niblung story).

Wirth, A. Ueber formelhafte und typische Elemente in der englisch-schottischen Volksballade. Halle: 1897.

Compare Fehr, Die formelhaften Elemente in den alten englischen Balladen (Berlin: 1900).

Wolff, E. Prolegomena der litterar-evolutionistischen Poetik. Kiel und Leipz.: 1890.

See p. 24 for an interesting suggestion as to the catharsis of epic and lyric. For further notice, see below, § 11.

Woodberry, G. E. The Torch. N.Y.: 1905.

In the chapters on Spenser and Milton the author expounds the relation of those poets to the 'race-mind.' The whole book is valuable as presenting a view of the social function of imaginative literature in general and of certain poems and authors in particular. It offers, in effect, a philosophy of the marvellous in literature, as exemplified in the nobler imaginative contents of the epic or any other type. Compare, by the same author, A New Defence of Poetry, in The Heart of Man (N.Y.: 1899).

Woodberry, G. E. The Appreciation of Literature. N.Y.: 1907. Pp. 61–77.

One of the best of short utterances upon the temper and spiritual basis of the epic. Epics are social poems, the earlier ones containing national traditions of the civilizations to which the authors belonged. The moral significance of the epic is found in its revelation of the social will organized in the life of nations, and in a collision which is social rather than individual. The social will is interpreted as the will of the gods, and the epic is thus essentially optimistic, though continually marked by the tragedy of defeated wills. "Sacrifice is a word writ large in the epical strife,—sacrifice of both victor and vanquished. It is obvious that the optimism of the epic lies in the efficacy of the sacrifice, that is, in the validity of the idea of social progress." In the religious sphere the epic presents the "notion that in the confused field of human action there is a supreme and fatal collision between the human will as such and the divine will in omnipotence."

Zimmermann, F. Ueber den Begriff des Epos. Darmstadt: 1848.

One of the most satisfactory philosophical disquisitions upon the epic. The theoretical trend of the essay is constantly enriched and checked by reference to the epics themselves. The epos is subsumed under the broader concept of epic poetry, and is defined as "die durch lebendige Einheit organisirte, rein objective und naive Darstellung von Begebenheiten heroischer Individuen nach ihrer ganzen Breite, in welchen sich die Totalität einer absoluten Vergangenheit abspiegelt" (p. 4). The differentiation of *Naturepos* and *Kunstepos* is thorough and careful (pp. 7–15). See especially pp. 14–15, where the German poetry of chivalry and Boiardo, Ariosto, and Tasso are assigned to a stage midway between the folk epic and the epic of the *Aufklärung*. See p. 18 for the author's opinion concerning communal authorship, "eine in der Luft der Zeit fahrende Influenza." On the "epischen allgemeinen Weltzustand," p. 27. Pp. 29–69 discuss the men and gods of the epic. P. 42, the freedom and necessity of the hero; two strains of epic treatment are noted. The discussion of the ways — plastic and other — in which the various epics handle their gods should be noticed. Pp. 69–94, the relation of the hero to the gods, and the historical character of the hero.

SECTION 9. OUTLINES OF THEORY BY NATIONALITIES: SPECIAL REFERENCES

In tracing in historical order the minor references to the theory of the epic, the student will find it convenient to refer to Gayley and Scott (cited above), Chap. VI, where the history of poetics in general is outlined. To be sure, no notice is taken there of particular types; but in the search for discussions of the various types this list of the chief ancient and modern treatises on poetics will be of considerable aid.

The following notes are in aim representative rather than exhaustive. In making use of them the student should bear in mind that the more important references, already cited in § 8, are seldom repeated here.

I. Greek Theory of the Epic.

For introductions to the history of Greek poetical theory in general, see above, § 3, 1; see also F. Adam and J. A. Hartung, as noted above, § 8. On philosophical criticism of poetry see also B. P. Kurtz, Studies in the Marvellous (Lond.: 1910; also in *Univ. Calif. Pubs. Philol.*, vol. I), where the history of Greek criticism of the fictitious and fabulous elements of poetry is traced; Gayley and Scott, pp. 139–159, — an extensive apparatus for the study of ancient theories of the relation of art to nature and truth.

In Greece literary criticism originated as an offshoot of a certain philosophical criticism of the moral improbabilities in the Homeric epics. As early as the 7th and 6th centuries B.C. the myths of Homer and Hesiod, it is said, were rejected by Theognis and Solon, who endeavored to purify the moral and religious sentiment of their age. Both Alcmaeon and Heraclitus were sceptical of popular myth, and the latter, according to Diogenes Laertius (Lives IX, 1), said that Homer ought to be driven from the Games. Pindar, too, realized the ethical improprieties of the old god-stories and even endeavored to substitute for them versions more in harmony with an exalted idea of divinity (see Pindar, O. I, 42 ff.; IX, 35 ff.; cf. N. VII, 20 ff.). Many other objections must have found expression; to us remain only the barest fragments of the philosophical thought of the earlier centuries. But with Xenophanes (Fragments 1, 5, 6, 7, 21) and Plato (Republic 378–383, 386–391) the indictment of Homer is complete. The epic poet is accused of depicting the gods as thieves, liars, and prostitutes; of retailing the disgraceful stories of the loves of Ares and Aphrodite, of the thefts of Hermes, of the war-god's cries on the fate of Ilium, and of the amours and boastings of Zeus. Eventually even the fictitious ('imitative') character of the poetic art was deprecated as "indiscriminate, hypocritical, futile, ignorant, inconsistent, provocative of irrational excess" (Gayley and Scott, p. 140, where references are given to Repub. 393–397, 595–607; Laws 669–674, 889; Sophist 219, 235–237, 264–267; Timaeus 19; Cratylus 423; for a late Greek criticism of Plato's "jealousy of Homer" see Dionysius of Halicarnassus — Letter to Pompeius, 756, Eng. trans. by W. R. Roberts, Dion. of Hal., p. 95). But in opposition to such a judgment Aristotle insisted (Poetics ix) that the standard of truth in poetry is not the same as in real life, and that indeed the very excellence of poetry consists in its feigning. This doctrine of poetic truth marked the rise of literary criticism as a discipline distinct from the philosophical indictment of ancient myth. Aristotle proceeded to consider the specific qualities of the epic as one species of feigning or imitation, to compare it with tragedy in respect of such qualities, and to argue for the aesthetic superiority of tragedy (for Aristotle see above, § 8). Aristotle's scattered remarks approach nearer to a systematic account of the epic than anything else in Greek criticism. When to them are added what Longinus says of Homer we have all that is essentially important in the remains of Greek epic criticism.

After Aristotle, literary criticism in part followed the lines laid down by the Stagirite, but remains of this criticism are lacking (for lost treatises on poetry see É. Egger, Hist. de la crit., Chap. IV; Nettleship — cited above, § 3, 1 — pp. 227–229). What we do possess of later Greek criticism is largely in the philosophical, moral vein, deriving from Plato rather than from Aristotle. Inasmuch as this moral criticism of poetry had its origin in objections to Homeric and other epic narratives of the gods, we had better regard here its further development. There is no evidence that Epicurus (342–270 B.C.) appreciated poetry, and there is a tradition that his pupil Metrodorus wrote an attack upon it. Epictetus (1st cent. after Christ) stoically regarded literary studies as a wayside inn, tempting the philosopher from his pursuit of pure freedom and contentment (Encheiridion lii). The Stoics, indeed, with their general distrust of the senses, adhered somewhat naturally, if not logically, to the ethical distrust of art, which they disdained as a species of 'cookery' (cf. Marcus Aurelius, Meditations i, 17, who thanked heaven that he had made little progress in rhetoric and poetry), or applauded only so far as it supplied ethical precepts. But Plutarch (1st cent. after Christ) thought that under proper restrictions and cautions poetry served as a valuable medium of ethical education, and in its fictitious character he found a palliative for its representation of the ignoble and disgraceful, — all of which marked a significant readjustment of view (How a Young Man Should Study Poetry i, ii, iv, vii–ix). Maximus Tyrius (2d cent. after Christ), who may be rated either as a rhetorician or an eclectic Platonic philosopher of minor magnitude, pointed out that Plato did not absolutely disapprove of Homer but only in relation to certain standards of the ideal republic (Essays, ed Reiske, xxiii). Tyrius discussed the philosophic significance of the Homeric epics (xxxii), and applied an allegorical method of interpretation not only to Homer and Hesiod but also to Sappho and Anacreon, — in fact to all poets, since he held that the poets embody philosophic truth in sensuous form (x). The sceptical philosopher Sextus Empiricus (*fl.* A.D. 200) notices with an innuendo that Clytemnestra, left under guardianship of a bard, murdered her husband, but acknowledges that poetry is useful for the proverbs it contains (Pyrrhonic Sketches: Against the Dogmatists). Philostratus (3d cent. after Christ; on the three Philostrati and the confusion of them and their works see K. Münscher in *Philologus* 1907, Supp. X, pp. 469–557) in his Heroic Dialogue attacked the historical accuracy of Homer but praised the poet's art. With Plotinus (A.D. *c.* 204–*c.* 270) and the Neoplatonic philosophy we encounter a mystical idealism that softens the moral rigor of the older Platonism and sees in poetry an approximation to the divine (see Bosanquet, p. 113). Thus the way is at last repaved for an aesthetically free criticism of the arts. Porphyry (A.D. 233–*c.* 304), the disciple of Plotinus, wrote a curious work (Quaestiones Homericae) in which he discussed such non-literary questions as why Penelope did not send Telemachus to her own parents for aid, or why men but not gods wash their hands before dining. In his De Antro Nympharum, based on the opening of the 13th book of the Odyssey (XIII, 102–112), Porphyry engaged in the allegorical explanation of myths for the purpose of harmonizing them with the higher moral conceptions, — a kind of interpretation that had been common for the last eight hundred years, ever since Theagenes of Rhegium (*c.* 525 B.C.) engaged in the vain and unhistorical procedure.

So much for the late philosophical and allegorical criticism of the Greeks, which may be traced sometimes in the innuendoes, sometimes in the direct statements of the various schools, but at other times must be deduced from their general philosophical character or trend. Scholarly and pedantic criticism arose in Alexandria, with such famous grammarians as Zenodotus, Aristophanes, and Aristarchus (onward from the 3d century B.C.). These critics busied themselves with establishing texts, dividing works into books and chapters, discussing philological questions of the narrower kind. For the method of Aristarchus, who prepared a critical edition of Homer, establishing the text with the division into books substantially as we have it now, see Susemihl's Gesch. der griech. Litt. in der Alexandrinerzeit, vol. I (Leipz.: 1891). A convenient aid, also, is the dissertation of W. Bachmann, Die ästhetischen Anschauungen Aristarchs, etc. (Nürnberg: 1902). Zoïlus, the Scourge of Homer (Homeromastix), so named because of his virulent attacks upon the Homeric poems (chiefly upon the fabulous in them), probably belonged to an earlier period (*c.* 400–320 B.C.), though there is a tradition that he lived during the time of Ptolemy Philadelphus (285–247 B.C.). On the Alexandrian classification of poetry and canons of poets, see above, § 3, 1, and the article "Classics" in the Encyc. Brit., 11th ed., which also gives further notices of Alexandrian and Pergamene scholarship. Other pedantic criticism, but most of it practically useless for the student of epic theory, will be found in great plenty in the Greek Scholiasts on Homer, for which, as well as for further materials of this period, see Saintsbury, Hist. Crit., vol. I, Chaps. IV and V of Book I.

But the most interesting loci of later Greek criticism of the epic are found in several essays on style, the greater number of which were written probably either in the first century before or the first century after the birth of Christ. Something, indeed, of the freshening of the imagination and wonder-spirit that characterized those centuries seems to have informed the critical opinion of these essays. Their enthusiasm is approbative, full of admiration of the stylistic excellence of great authors. Naturally such sympathetic estimate of style cannot be said to contribute greatly to the theory of the epic as a separate type; but it reveals a free, aesthetic attitude toward poetry, — an enjoyment of poetry for its own beauties and not for its fancied pedagogical virtues. The essay On the Sublime, attributed to one Longinus (date uncertain), contains the finest and most famous passages of appreciative appraisal that have come down to us from classical antiquity. As Gibbon pointed out (Journal, Sept. 3, 1762), Longinus again and again criticizes a beautiful passage by telling us his feelings upon reading it, and he "tells them with such energy, that he communicates them." Nor is there any passage in the essay more full of this splendid appreciative energy than the celebrated chapter on Homer (Chap. IX; see also other references to Homer, a list of which may be found on p. 228 of the admirable edition and translation by W. R. Roberts, Cambridge: 1899). Longinus' adverse criticism of the fabulous in the Odyssey is also contained in this chapter. Whether this criticism is based upon the philosophical objections noted above, or is aesthetic in character is an interesting question. — Other essays of this period on style deal with oratory rather than poetry, but their authors, as was common in antiquity, drew "as freely from the poets as from prose-writers, clearly believing that the study of poetic style should help, rather than injure, the study of prose style." The best examples of passages on epic poets are in the works and letters of Dionysius of Halicarnassus (several references are given in W. R. Roberts' edition and translation of the Three Literary Letters, Cambridge: 1901; see the Index, p. 223, under Homer), and in the On Style attributed to Demetrius Phalereus (see the references in the Index, p. 327, under Homer, of W. R. Roberts' edition and translation, Demetrius on Style, Cambridge: 1902). — For further notice of the rhetorics and technical school grammars, see Saintsbury, Sandys, Roberts, and É. Egger (p. 3, note 2, and Chap. IV) as cited above, § 3, 1; also M. Egger, Denys d'Halicarnasse, Essai sur la critique litt. et la rhétorique chez les Grecs (Paris: 1902).

For Greek Byzantine criticism see Saintsbury, Hist. Crit., vol. I, Bk. I, Chap. VI; Krumbacher, as cited in the Appendix.

Editions and Translations. For a convenient edition and translation of the pre-socratic philosophers see A. Fairbanks, The First Philosophers of Greece (Lond.: 1898). Ernest Myers' translation of Pindar, Jowett's of Plato, Butcher's of Aristotle's Poetics, Padelford's of Plutarch's How a Young Man Should Study Poetry (*Yale Studies in English*, XV, 1902), W. R. Roberts' of Longinus, Dionysius, and Demetrius, T. W. H. Rolleston's of the Encheiridion and T. Taylor's of Plotinus are recommended. Maximus Tyrius has recently been edited by H. Hobein (Leipz.: 1910); for Sextus Empiricus see the edition by Fabricius (Leipz.: 1840); for Philostratus, the Teubner edition by Kayser; for Plotinus, the edition of Creuzer (Lond.: 1862) or that of R. Volkmann (1883–84). A list of references on Plotinus is offered by Gayley and Scott, p. 113. Porphyry's Hom. Quests. have been edited by H. Schrader (1880, 1890); the De Antro Nymph. by A. Nauck (1885), which also was translated by Thomas Taylor (1823). For the Scholiasts on Homer see the edition by Dindorf and Maas (6 vols. Oxford: 1855–88); for the rhetoricians see Walz's Rhetores Graeci (1832). Fuller bibliography on all the Greek critics may be found in W. von Christ's Gesch. d. griech. Litt. (5th ed., noted above, § 5).

II. Roman Theory of the Epic.

For introduction to the history of Roman poetical theory in general, see above, § 3, 1; see also F. Adam, as noted above, § 8.

Roman criticism of the epic is almost negligible. It consists primarily of brief criticisms of style, adulation of Homer, fragmentary remarks upon the character of the epic, repetitions of the Alexandrian canons of epic poets and drawing up of similar canons of Roman poets, verbal interpretation, and commentaries on the text of Virgil. First to be considered is the continuation of formal Alexandrian poetics by the lost De Poematis of Varro and the famous Ad Pisones (Ars Poetica) of Horace. Doubtless many other works of the same sort have been lost. The De Poematis "was in all probability an enumeration of the different kinds of poetry, made on the basis of some post-Aristotelian work, perhaps that of Theophrastus." The kinds considered were, perhaps, dramatic, narrative, and mixed (i. e. narrative and dramatic, which would include epic, elegy, epode, satire, and bucolic). Some description of each sort and sub-type must have been given, with references to great examples. On this work see Nettleship, pp. 233–234. Horace, whose Ars Poetica is said to have been modeled upon the lost poetics of an Alexandrian, Neoptolemus of Parium (see Nettleship, pp. 228–229, 251), informs us that the hexameter is dedicated to "res gestae regumque ducumque et tristia bella" (Ars Poetica 73–74); that the epic poet should imitate Homer by beginning modestly, by driving rapidly "in medias res," by passing over what cannot be made illustrious, by so mixing the real and feigned that it is "impossible to tell the opening from the middle, the middle from the end" (A.P. 136–152); that fiction to be pleasing must be kept as near as possible to the truth (A.P. 338–340); that "bonus dormitat Homerus" (A.P. 359); that Homer was a great war poet and a great moral teacher (A.P. 401–404; Epist. I, ii); and that Ennius was scarcely a second Homer, but that Virgil is the equal of his own critical fame (Epist. II, i, 50–51, 245–247). — Next the student may turn to the rhetoricians, noting Quintilian's brief but judicious appraisals of the Greek epic (Institutes X, i, 46–59) and the Roman epic (Inst. X, i, 85–92), and his arrangement of the poets in canons. Quintilian's models or sources were probably Theophrastus and such Alexandrian critics as Aristarchus and Aristophanes. The resemblance of several of his critical estimates to passages in the De Imitatione of Dionysius of Halicarnassus has been noted by Nettleship (pp. 258–262). — For other but negligible notices of epic poets see Halm's Rhetores Latini (2 vols. Leipz.: 1863), and compare Saintsbury, Hist. Crit., 1: 345–354 (2d ed.). — Learned comment and verbal criticism are represented by the great commentary of Servius (*fl.* end of 4th century after Christ) on Virgil (ed. G. Thilo and H. Hagen, 1878–1902; cf. review by Nettleship in *Journ. of Philol.*, X), which contains in its vast bulk very little that is of value to the student of epic theory (cf. Saintsbury, Hist. Crit., 1 : 334–340). With Servius we may associate another learned commentator, Aelius Donatus (*fl.* middle of 4th century), fragments of whose commentary on Virgil have been preserved and criticized by Servius. Another Donatus (Tiberius Claudius), contemporary with Servius, wrote a commentary on the Aeneid (see O. Ribbeck, Prolegomena to Virgil; text in G. Fabricius' ed. of Virgil, 1561, ed. H. Georges, vol. I, 1905). — For the rest, the student may search Roman writers in general for brief notices of Homer, Virgil, and the lesser epic poets. In the works of Cicero, Ovid, Petronius, Seneca Rhetor, Seneca the Younger (Dialog. X), Persius, Juvenal, Martial, Pliny the Younger, Statius (Genethliacon Lucani, etc.), and Ausonius this search may be conducted with more or less success, but, on the whole, with little profit. Special mention must be made of the Noctes Atticae of A. Gellius (*fl.* 2d century after Christ). Embedded in this compendium of curious learning are many remarks pertaining to the style of various epic poets, to verbal criticism, and even to the history of epic poetry (see, e.g., 1 : 21, 2 : 6, 3 : 11, 5 : 8, 6 : 6, 7 : 20, 9 : 9, 10 : 16, 12 : 2, 13 : 26, 18 : 5). The comparison of Virgil and Pindar on Aetna (17 : 10), the chief reference for the epic student, was answered much later by Scaliger (Poetice V, 4), who refers with approval to Pontanus and others who had come to the defense of Virgil. The criticism of Gellius has been summarized in a helpful way under heads corresponding to the chief literary types by Benedetto Romano (La critica letteraria in Aulo Gellio. Torino: 1902). In the Saturnalia of Macrobius (5th century), another curious compendium, the student may search for further and somewhat similar materials, especially on Virgil (see Libri III–IV; V deals with the relation of Virgil to the Greeks and to Homer in particular).

Before leaving ancient criticism, Greek and Roman, one important observation remains to be made, namely, that throughout antiquity a wide range of poems was commonly regarded as 'epic.' Generally speaking, hexameter poems were called 'epics,' whether they were heroic in character (as the Iliad, Odyssey, the Cyclic Epics, the Argonautica, Aeneid, Pharsalia, Thebaid), or didactic (as the Works and Days of Hesiod, the poems of Xenophanes, Parmenides, and Empedocles, the De Rerum Natura of Lucretius), or commemorative of religious mysteries (as the reputed Orphic poems, or the Theogony of Hesiod). To be sure, Aristotle had protested against grouping Homer and Empedocles under one head (Poetics i, 6–9), and had provided the basis for distinguishing types according to method of imitation; but the formal view that the metre determined the type of the poem dominated ancient criticism as a whole, and was incompatible with any very profound consideration of the spiritual and social distinctions of the various poetic kinds. Neo-classical criticism labored under similar formal conceptions, even developing in a purely formal way the Aristotelian principle of imitation. It remained for modern philosophical and romantic criticism to attempt a differentiation according to the social scale, the spiritual content, or the cultural stage of the poem.

Editions and References. The less familiar texts have been sufficiently indicated above. Texts and translations of Horace, Quintilian, and other well-known Latin writers are readily accessible. For extensive bibliography see the histories of Schanz and Teuffel.

III. Latin Christian Criticism of the Dark Ages.

For general apparatus for the study of patristic and pre-medieval Latin criticism, see above, § 3, II.

Of literary theory proper nothing, or next to nothing, is to be found in this long period. At first (2d century to the period of Constantine, 323) the Fathers of the Church were engaged in combating the old religion and establishing the new. Part of their task consisted in attacking the stories, or myths, of paganism; and because these were embodied in the arts, the Fathers were opposed to the arts themselves. Artistic power and appreciation were held to be a machination of demons; the arts were thought to have originated among the fallen angels who forsook heaven for the daughters of men. But literature, and the epic in particular, was the chief repository of pagan myth. Hence it came about that the Fathers were particularly bitter against Homer and, to a less degree, Virgil and Lucan. The opposition to Homer was more pronounced among the Latin than among the Greek Fathers, — a fact due perhaps to the greater familiarity of the latter with the poet. This general opposition to secular literature may be traced in the works of Tertullian (see especially his Apologeticus, De Spectaculis, De Idololatria, and Ad Nationes), Cyprian, Arnobius (Adversus Gentes, especially Books III, IV, V), Lactantius (Institutiones), and Commodianus (Instructiones). For typical references to Homer, from whom "every depraved writer gets his dreams," see Chap. 22 of the Octavius of Minucius Felix, and Bk. I, Chap. 10, and II, 7, 9, of Tertullian's Ad Nationes. Further references to Homer and other epic authors may be traced by means of the General Index in vol. X of the American edition of the Ante-Nicene Fathers. In general, this 'puritanic' opposition to the poets may be compared with Plato's view of the poets, and with the Academic, Stoic, Pyrrhonist, and modern Puritan attitude toward literature. A profound philosophic conviction or idealism and a profound religious 'otherworldliness' alike tend toward impatience with and disapproval of the lightness and the fictions of secular poetry (see Saintsbury, Hist. Crit., 1: 380–382). This criticism of literature, then, relies upon moral and philosophical — not upon literary and aesthetic — criteria.

Later, from the time of Constantine (323) on, the gradual assimilation of the pagan arts by Christian culture mitigated the severity of patristic condemnation of the pagan epics. Even St. Augustine's disapproval of the "sweetly vain" fictions of Homer and Virgil (Confessions I, 13, 14) lacks the declamatory fury of Tertullian (see further in the Confessions, and note in Augustine's other works the frequent quotations from Virgil; translations in Schaff's Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers). But no aesthetic theory of poetry was developed. Instead, the allegorical interpretation of Fulgentius appeared, — symptomatic of a changing attitude. After the manner of the Stoics and the Neoplatonists, and with some slight Christian additions, Fulgentius (first part of the 6th century, or last part of the 5th) proceeded to expound the inner meaning of the old myths (see his Expositio Vergilianae Continentiae, which supplements his larger Mythologiarum Libri III, ed. R. Helm, Teubner Series, 1898; cf. Saintsbury, Hist. Crit., 1: 393–396). Already Christians were familiar with the allegorical interpretation of the legends of the Old Testament, which had been instituted in the 4th century by Hilary of Poitiers and Ambrose of Milan, and which may be traced back to Origen and Philo Judaeus. The New Testament itself (e.g. Gal. iii, 16; iv, 21–31) uses this method of interpretation. After Fulgentius the allegorical interpretation of profane (as well as sacred) literature becomes more and more common. In the Middle Ages and the Renaissance it was regularly recognized as a method of criticism (see Grandgent, Dante, pp. 244–277, and Spingarn, Lit. Crit. in Renaiss., p. 8). For a brief but suggestive explanation of the prevalence of medieval allegory, see E. Brehaut, An Encyclopedist of the Dark Ages (Diss., Columbia. N.Y.: 1912), pp. 65–67. — Isidore of Seville (*c.* 560–636) held that Christians should not read the fictions of the poets (Differentiae III, 13, 1; cf. Etymologiae VIII, 7). In his account of Grammar, under the head of Metres, heroic verse is defined as that which narrates the deeds of brave men, and Moses is said to have been the first to compose hexameters (Etymologiae I, 39, 9). The remarks on the forming of Centos on various, including Biblical, subjects by ingenious recombination of verses from Homer or Virgil (*ibid.*, I, 39, 25–26) lay open a strange development of epic material that the curious student may follow further (see Encyc. Brit., Art. Cento). For the works of Isidore, see Migne, or the Oxford edition of the Etymologiae, ed. W. M. Lindsay, 1911; see also E. Brehaut, *op. cit.*; Dressel, De Isidori Originum Fontibus (in *Rivista di Filologia*, vol. III, 1874–75).

IV. **Greek Fathers of the Church.**

For accounts of Greek patristic literature see Battifol, Les anciennes litt. chrét.: La litt. grecque (2d ed. Paris: 1898); W. Christ, Gesch. der griech. Litt. bis auf die Zeit Justinians (2d ed. 1890; in Müller's Handb. der klass. Altertums-Wissenschaft); G. Krüger, Hist. of Early Christian Lit. in the First Three Centuries, trans. by C. R. Gillett (N.Y.: 1897). Further references in Krüger, pp. 4–10; also in Christ.

The Greek Fathers were somewhat less bitter against ancient art and religion than were the Latin Fathers. A wider and more philosophical education inclined the Greeks to harmonize the pagan and Christian cultures by premising that the former was a propaedeutic to the latter. Not seldom, by way of proof, the Greek Fathers are at pains to select those passages from the epic, lyric, and dramatic poets and from the philosophers of antiquity which evince monotheistic conceptions. Thus they did not raise against art and poetry the extreme and indignant puritanical criticism found in the polemic and apologetic literature of the Western Church. Their fainter objections scarcely confused the aesthetic appreciation of literature.

Justin the Martyr, in his Apology, holds indeed that pagan beliefs are machinations of the demons. But in the Hortatory Address to the Greeks and the Monarchy of God, both formerly attributed to him, Homer and the dramatists are cited in support of the unity of God. Tatian's Address to the Greeks is more bitter in criticism of the pagan gods. The Greek poets are often quoted. Similar criticism and quotation are to be found in the Plea for the Christians of Athenagoras the Athenian and in the Autolycus of Theophilus of Antioch. Clement of Alexandria, in his Exhortation to the Heathen, shows the folly of polytheism, quotes Homer and the dramatists, and yet does not anathematize all poetry. Clement can draw distinctions. See also his Stromateis, Paedagogue, and the treatise Against the Stage, Bk. IV, Cap. xi.

Editions. For bibliography of each of the above, and of other Greek Fathers, see Krüger, pp. 100–138, 162–255; translations may be found in the American or Edinburgh edition of the Ante-Nicene Fathers.

V. **Italian.**

For general apparatus see above, § 3, III.

A. *To the End of the Renaissance.*

For apparatus see above, § 3, III, A. In Spingarn see pp. 107–124; in Blankenburg-Sulzer see the article Heldengedicht (vol. II, pp. 9–10). Of great aid and interest are pp. 15–94 of Finsler's work, noted above, § 8. Irene Myers (cited in § 8) gives a very brief review of the chief Italian writers on the epic (pp. 15–20).

Before considering the neo-classicism of the Renaissance it will be well to remember that the critics of this period inherited from the Middle Ages a method of studying and interpreting literature which continued to flourish side by side with the new humanistic tendencies. This was the allegorical, the rise of which we have already noted (see above, I; III, under Fulgentius; also Spingarn, pp. 7–10). Applied alike to sacred and profane literature, this method of interpretation presupposed that it was of the essence of poetry to hide moral truths in pleasing fictions (cf. Isidore of Seville, Etymolog. VIII, 7, 10), — a conception the similarity of which to the teachings of Plutarch and the Stoics the reader will readily recognize. Nor should one neglect to observe that such interpretation offered in reality a means of turning against the Platonic and other moral 'Puritans' their own objections to poetic fiction. Fictions, to be sure, said the allegorical school, but fictions that are intended to teach truth in popular forms, thus rendering incalculable service! Moreover, so generally recognized and followed was the method of interpretation that the poets themselves consciously adopted it as the soul of their creative production. Dante, to take the greatest example, explained his poem as having four meanings: literal, 'allegorical,' moral, and anagogical or mystical (Epist. XI, 7; Convito, II, 1, 1; see also Grandgent, Chap. XI Allegory). It must be remembered, too, that during the Middle Ages poetry was commonly classified by the encyclopedists as a form of philosophy, for which some authority was found in the ancients (see Spingarn, pp. 24–27). From this circumstance derives largely, perhaps, the popularity of allegorical interpretation.

But what concerns us here is that this method of criticism, if it can be called such, was applied for the most part, naturally enough, to epical narratives, even as the moral criticism of poetry had historically begun with the Greek philosophic objections to the epic fictions of Homer. Lyric fiction was not fiction, or at least was seldom fiction, in the same sense of the term; dramatic fiction was a thing little known during the Middle Ages. It is indeed in Fulgentius' lucubrations concerning the Aeneid, or in Dante on the Divine Comedy as just noted, or in Petrarch's letter De Quibusdam Fictionibus Virgilii (Opera, 1554, p. 867), that we find the typical examples of this moral-utilitarian criticism, — the common method of Theagenes of Rhegium, Porphyry, Plutarch, Tzetzes, Origen, Philo Judaeus, Hilary of Poitiers, Ambrose of Milan, Fulgentius, Dante, Boccaccio, Leonardo Bruni, and hundreds of others, known or forgotten. The student of epic criticism who is ignorant of this long and ancient line misses much of what the epic has meant in the past, and he who neglects it is unhistorical in his own conception of both epic and epical criticism. To trace the history of this line in detail, so far as that is possible, noting its characteristic deflections as it passes from age to age, from one philosophy or religion to another, is a task that if sympathetically performed would not be devoid of profound interest and significance.

From the Middle Ages also, and indirectly from Horace, whose Ars Poetica was known throughout the Dark and Middle Ages (see Spingarn, p. 11), descended another and yet allied way of regarding poetry, viz., as a great civilizing agent (cf. Ars Poetica, 391–401; for an early statement of this conception see Aeschylus' self-defense in the Frogs of Aristophanes). Mr. J. E. Spingarn has pointed out that in his Sylvae (written toward the end of the 15th century) Poliziano adopts this view, and adds:

> The second section of the Sylvæ discusses the bucolic poets; the third contains that glorification of Virgil which began during the Middle Ages, and, continued by Vida and others, became in Scaliger literary deification; and the last section is devoted to Homer, who is

considered as the great teacher of wisdom, and the wisest of the ancients. Nowhere does Poliziano exhibit any appreciation of the aesthetic value of poetry, but his enthusiasm for the great poets, and indeed for all forms of ancient culture, is unmistakable, and combined with his immense erudition marks him as a representative poet of humanism (Lit. Crit., pp. 13–14).

Mr. Spingarn proceeds to contrast with this work a contemporaneous puritanic conception of poetry, that of Savonarola (in his De Divisione ac Utilitate Omnium Scientiarum, *c.* 1492).

As he turns to the 16th century the student should bear in mind that from Capriano Bresciano and Minturno on, with the exception of Castelvetro, the epic was considered the chief form of poetry, Aristotle to the contrary notwithstanding (see, e.g., G. P. Capriano Bresciano, Della vera poetica libro uno, Vinegia: 1555, Cap. IV, V). The history of the criticism of the epic may be considered under five heads: (1) Horatian criticism; (2) rise of Aristotelian criticism; (3) the quarrel between the classicists and the supporters of the romantic epics of Boïardo and Ariosto, which eventuated in (4) the quarrel over Tasso's attempt in the Gerusalemme to combine Aristotelian formalism and romantic variety; (5) the controversy with regard to the unity of the Divine Comedy. As a whole this epic criticism is formal and legislative, narrowly and naïvely Aristotelian, prescriptive rather than interpretative, absolute rather than historical. Nevertheless several notable attempts were made to broaden critical dogma by an induction of principles from modern as well as ancient poetry, — attempts undertaken in defense of the romantic epics against the charge that they lacked unity.

From Horace descends the first great 'art of poetry' of the Renaissance: Vida's Latin Ars Poetica (1527; written before 1520) — an attempt to lay down rules for the epic from a study of the practice of Virgil. "His description of the ideal epic is indeed nothing more or less than a refined analysis of the Aeneid; and students desirous of learning what the Italians of the sixteenth century admired in Virgil, will do well to study its acute and sober criticism." But Vida is concerned formally, like his master, Horace, with matters of style and invention, polish and decorum; of deeper critical problems — definition, inner form, social significance, and function — he knows nothing. His comparison of Virgil and Homer should be read in the light of previous comparisons by Petrarch, Poliziano, Valla, and Vittorino da Feltre (see Finsler, 15 ff.). In 1535 Dolce translated the Ars Poetica, with which should be compared the same author's Osservationi (Vinegia: 1560). Daniello, in his La Poetica (Vinegia: 1536; cf. Irene Myers, p. 16), copies Horace's definition of the epic — a poem about the heroic deeds of great kings and leaders; but at the same time, like Aristotle, he contrasts the verisimilitude of the poet with the sober fact of the historian. Scaliger, the greatest critic of the century (Poetics, 1561, commented upon above, § 8), is also perhaps more Horatian than Aristotelian. For him the epic, the story of the lives and deeds of heroes, is the greatest of poems. Scaliger belongs to the company, already noted, of Virgil worshippers, and his attacks upon Homer as well as his defense of Virgil against the strictures of Aulus Gellius (*q.v.*) supply some of the most interesting and significant portions of his epic criticism. For other works on Virgil see those by Regolo (1563), Maranta (1564), Toscanella (1566), Fulvius Ursinus (1567), etc.

We may now briefly note the rise of the Aristotelian strain of epic criticism. The significance of the discovery of Aristotle's Poetics was well indicated by the French critic Rapin (1621–1687):

> We have had no Books of Poesie till this last Age; when that of Aristotle, with his other Works, were brought from Constantinople to Italy; where immediately appear'd a great Number of Commentators, who writ upon this Book of Poesie: The chief whereof were Victorius, Robortellus, Madius, who literally enough interpreted the Text of this Philosopher, without diving much into his Meaning. These were follow'd by Castelvetro, Piccolomini, Beni, Riccobon, Majoragius, Minturnus, Vida [*sic*], Patricius, Andre Gili, Vossius, and many others. But Vossius has Commented on him meerly as a Scholiast, Gili as a Rhetorician, Patricius as an Historian, Vida as a Poet, who endeavours more to please than to instruct; Minturnus as an Orator,

Majoragius and Riccobon as Logicians, Beni as a Doctor who has a sound Judjment when the Honour of his Country is not concern'd. For he compares Ariosto with Homer, and Tasso with Virgil, in a treatise made expressly upon that subject. Castelvetro and Piccolomini have acquitted themselves as able Criticks, and much better than the rest; Piccolomini deals with Aristotle more fairly than Castelvetro, who is naturally of a morose Wit; and out of a cross Humour makes it always his Business to contradict Aristotle, and for the most part confounds the Text, instead of explaining it. Notwithstanding all this, he is the most subtle of all the Commentators, and the Man from whom most may be learned (The Whole Critical Works of M. Rapin. 2 vols., 2d ed., Lond.: 1716, vol. II, pp. 132–133).

For the early Italian editions and Latin and Italian translations of the Poetics of Aristotle, see Gayley and Scott, p. 518 ff. Particularly important are the editions, translations, or commentaries by Pazzi (1536), Daniello (1536), Robortelli (1548), Segni (1549), Maggi (1550), Vettori (1560), Piccolomini (1575), and Riccoboni (1587). For Salviati's account of the commentators up to 1586, see Spingarn, Appendix B. Robortelli's In Librum Aristotelis de Arte Poetica Explicationes (Firenze: 1548) is an extended commentary, passage by passage, which should be studied as conveying the early Italian conception of Aristotle on epic, tragedy, and comedy. Maggi, or Madius (Madius and Lombardus, Poetica Arist., 1550), appears to have been the first to suggest a unity of time for the epic (Ebner, Beitrag zu einer Gesch. d. dramat. Einheiten in Ital., *Münch. Beiträge*, 15: 38), — a suggestion that in Minturno (Poetica, 1564) and D'Aubignac (see below, VI, c) becomes a definite rule of one year.

From Trissino we have the first Italian art of poetry based upon Aristotle (Le sei divisioni della poetica, §§ V, VI, on epic, 1563; §§ I–IV, 1529). The differentiation of epic and tragedy with reference to object and means of imitation and to unity and duration of action, the remarks upon the province of the improbable and impossible, and the comparison of epic and history — the epic *loci* of the Poetics — are all repeated by Trissino. See B. Morsolin, G. Trissino, etc. (2d ed. Firenze: 1884).

Trissino's criticism of the Italian romantic epics (see Boiardo, Ariosto, *et al.* in § 12, below) for their lack of unity (see the dedication to his Aristotelian epic, Italia Liberata, finished by 1548) provoked the chief controversy in the epic criticism of the 16th century. Against the attack of the classicists, Cintio, Pigna, and Castelvetro defended the *romanzi* on the ground that they constitute a new sort of heroic poetry to which the Aristotelian rule of epic unity cannot logically be applied. For notices of Cintio (1549) and Pigna (1554) see above, § 8. In 1559 appeared Minturno's De Poeta, and in 1564 his Arte Poetica (cf. Sulzer, vol. II, p. 505; Irene Myers, p. 18), which should be studied as upholding the hostile criticism of the *romanzo*. Minturno, it may be noted by the way, adapts Aristotle's definition of tragedy to the epic, divides narrative poetry into three grades of which the highest is the imitation of the life of a single hero (epic proper, or *eroici*), and believes that the Christian religion affords all machinery necessary to an epic poem. In Castelvetro the century recognized one of its greatest masters of criticism. Coming to the defense of the romantic epics, he nevertheless conceded that a stricter unity of action gives a greater poetic effect. He distinguished different varieties of the epic; he carefully differentiated epic from tragedy, which had not been done by such classicists as Scaliger and Minturno. In opposition to the general opinion of the century he esteemed tragedy more highly than epic. To Aristotelian formulae he added the requirement that the subject of the epic be historical. The reader will discover in Castelvetro a power of drawing distinctions and a breadth of view unusual among the critics of this period. See especially his Poetica d' Aristotele vulgarizzata et sposta (1570; Basilea: 1576), — the 1576 edition containing a full index (see *Epopea* and the names of the chief classical and Italian epic poets); see also Gli Eroici, etc. (Vinegia: 1561). The Opere varie critiche (Lione: 1727) are accessible. Compare also Spingarn, p. 111; Irene Myers, p. 18; A. Fusco, La poetica di L. Castelvetro (Napoli: 1904); H. B. Charlton, Castelvetro's

Theory of Poetry (Manchester, Univ. Press: 1913). For other examples of the classicist view see the Poetica of Denores (1588), which repeats Aristotle in a naïve way, briefly compares Virgil and Homer, and illustrates the perfect tragic, epic, and comic themes by the tales of Boccaccio; also the Dialogo primo and the Dial. secondo sopra Virgilio of Sperone Speroni (Dialoghi del Sig. S. Speroni, etc. Ven.: 1596).

For Tasso's attempt (1564, 1587, etc.) to harmonize the Aristotelian unity of form with the varied matter of medieval romance — an attempt first made in theory and then in practice — see above, § 8, under Tasso. Whereas Cintio, Pigna, and Castelvetro had distinguished a romantic type of epic that did not require unity of action, it was now generally admitted that every epic must possess some sort of unity: the new question was, what sort? Tasso's or Homer's? Moreover, both sides of the controversy appealed to Aristotle. For an account of the controversy — of Camillo Pellegrino's exaltation of Tasso's Gerusalemme Liberata above Ariosto's Orlando Furioso (Il Caraffa, 1583/4), of Lionardo Salviati's defense of the latter (Difesa dell' O. F., 1585), of Tasso's Apologia (1585), and of smaller fry — see Finsler, pp. 73–81, or Spingarn, pp. 122–124; longer accounts in the histories of Italian literature. A very satisfactory chapter on the matter is contained in Solerti's Vita di T. Tasso (Torino: 1895); and for many of the documents of the controversy see vols. 18–23 of Rosini's edition of the Opere of Tasso. But of all the writing brought out by the episode, F. Patrizzi's (or Patrici's) Della Poetica (Ferrara: 1585/6) is for the modern student most significant. Here is a poetics that is inductive in method, — an attempt to formulate the principles of poetry from the whole history of poetry, instead of from a few Greek masterpieces only. Aristotle is criticized severely, as contradictory, difficult, and mistaken. Finsler notices the work appreciatively; cf. Saintsbury, Hist. Crit., 2: 94–101. With it may be compared a work — not belonging to this controversy — that went still further in breaking with critical traditions, — the first dialogue of Giordani Bruno's

Eroici Furori (Lond.: 1585), a protest against all rule-giving poetics. Bruno points out that the poet is not made by rules, but that rules are made from the poet's practice, — a position not dissimilar to that of Croce to-day. Bruno does not, however, conceive the possibility of underlying laws, psychological and economic, of literary development. For defenses of Aristotle see F. Buonamici's Discorsi poetici (1597) and F. Summo's work of the same title (Padova: 1600). Needless to say, the dogmatists triumphed.

Finally was started the Dante controversy by Varchi, who in his Ercolano (1570) praised Dante at the expense of Homer. J. Mazzoni's Difesa di Dante (Cesena: 1573) and his longer Della difesa della Commedia di Dante (Cesena: 1587) stand out from the works contributed to this discussion (see Saintsbury, Hist. Crit., 2: 105; Spingarn, 124, Note). Mazzoni met the common charge against the Divine Comedy — that it lacks the conventional traits of the epic — by asserting that the poem is not an epic, but a comedy. For further notice of the debate see the histories of Italian literature.

B. *The Seventeenth Century.*

For apparatus see above, § 3, III, B. Blankenburg, Quadrio, Gayley and Scott, Saintsbury, Foffano, and Belloni are helpful; especially valuable are pp. 82–94 of Finsler's work, noted above, § 8.

In striking contrast to the critical significance of the previous century this period offers little to repay the drudgery of research. It was an age of debased taste (on the Marinism of the period see above, § 6, VIII, G) and over-production, of conceit, paradox, and subtlety, of sensational oddity and superficial novelty. On the superabundance of treatises — of critical censure, apology, and allegory, of arts of poetry and aesthetic essays — and on the almost total lack in these of originality, acumen, and method, see Belloni. Only a few typical utterances are noted here. Further material may be traced in the references given above, and by means of the references to lesser Italian critics contained in the notes to Lib. II of B. Menzini's Dell' Arte poetica (Firenze: 1688).

We may omit discussion of many poetics and commentaries upon Aristotle, such as those of P. Beni (1613), Giov. Bern. Brandi, Chiodino da Monte Melone, Horat. Marta, Cam. Pellegrino, Giov. Colle Bellunese, Celso Zani, Flav. Querengo, Loretto Mattei, and Ces. Grazzini (the last two translators of Horace's Ars Poetica; for titles of these see Gayley and Scott, *l. c.*), and note briefly a form of criticism brought into great vogue in this century by Traiano Boccalini. His Ragguagli di Parnaso (1612) is a fantastic allegorical satire upon contemporary politics and literature. Apollo sits in judgment upon complaints offered by various figures, and his decisions distribute the author's criticisms, not a few of which bear in a light way upon epical writing. This ornamental method of attack appealed to the taste of the period and found many imitators immediate and remote, both in Italy and elsewhere (see Belloni for imitations; cf. G. B. Marchesi, I Ragguagli di Parnaso e la critica letteraria nel secolo XVII, in *Giornale storico*, 27: 78–93; J. E. Spingarn, Critical Essays, vol. I, p. xxiii ff.; R. Brotanek, in *Archiv für das Studium der neueren Sprachen*, 1903, 3: 409–414; G. Mestica, T. Boccalini e la letteratura critica e politica del seicento, Firenze: 1878).

Among the chief vocations of the critics of the age was the writing of essays upon the Gerusalemme Liberata or upon Dante, — for the most part Aristotelian or superficially original. A number of such works may be encountered in Belloni and Tiraboschi; early in the century (1616) appeared P. Beni's commentary on the Gerusalemme.

Perhaps the most striking example of the critical perversity of the century was its depreciation of Homer. As far back as Vida, to be sure, Homer had been slighted; and the quarrel over the Gerusalemme Liberata had been productive of anti-Homeric criticism. But now all this was exaggerated into Homerophobia. Paolo Beni (Comparazione di T. Tasso con Homero e Virgilio, insieme col commento, Padova: 1616) not only came to the defense of Tasso's poem and theories, but proceeded to anathematize Homer by bell, book, and candle. The 'book' in this case was the Poetics of Aristotle, for Beni accepted the critical canons of the ancients and turned them against the classics themselves, — a procedure that reminds us of that adopted by Tasso before and Addison afterward. Of epic poets in this case Tasso is rated the highest, then Ariosto, third Virgil, and lowest of all, Homer. For Homer's characters are unworthy, wanting in piety; his construction lacks unity (cf. Salviati's Difesa) and his episodes are poorly managed; his style is disfigured by repetitions, and his story-telling is prolix and boresome. Moreover, Tasso's epic is superior to Virgil's because the former appeals to all Italy, whereas the latter appealed to Rome only; superior to Homer's because Tasso depicted the happy conclusion of war. Alessandro Tassoni went a step further by maintaining the supremacy of the moderns in all poetic kinds except tragedy and comedy (see Lib. IX, Cose poetiche, istoriche e varie, of his Pensieri diversi, 1612, first published in 1601 as Questioni filosofiche; in Lib. X, Ingegni antichi e moderni, pp. 371–454 of the 1646 ed., and Cap. XIV, Poeti antichi e moderni, pp. 393–395, he divides poetry into its kinds and comments briefly on each). The utter rejection of Homer was accomplished with spectacular superficiality by Udeno Nisieli (i.e. Benedetto Fioretti) in his Proginnasmi poetici (5 vols. Firenze: 1620–39). A devotee of Tasso and scorner of Ariosto, he revolts from Aristotle (cf. Patrizzi and Bruno), and pillories the Homeric poems as examples of everything that poetry should avoid. Homer is for him the consummate artistic failure of antiquity. With these utterances may be compared Niccola Villani's critical lucubrations, especially his Considerazioni di Messer Fagiano sopra la seconda parte dell' Occhiale del cav. Stigliani, in which are included (pp. 155–230) various observations upon Dante (see Cosmo, Le osservazioni alla Divina Commedia di Niccola Villani, Città di Castello: 1894).

C. *The Eighteenth Century.*

For apparatus see above, § 3, III, C. Finsler, Blankenburg, Concari, and Saintsbury are especially helpful.

During this century, which witnessed the revival of political and spiritual life known as the *Risorgimento*, critical taste put away Marinism, and, after dallying with the affected pastoral simplicity of the Arcadian school (cf. above, § 6, VIII, H), turned again to the ancient classics for instruction and inspiration. Epic criticism renewed its interest in Homer, and not seldom is the Greek poet, contrary to the taste of the previous century, valued above Virgil. New interest also is shown in Dante. The details of criticism concern epic technique in general; the construction of the 'fable' and the probability of action are especially favored themes. The propriety of introducing gods and the marvellous is also debated, — a question mooted from Scaliger to Perrault. The greater part of this criticism is Aristotelian in derivation and tendency, though the student will find some critical independence and even anti-Aristotelian assertion. On the other hand, the statement of the Homeric question by Vico, the antiquarianism of Muratori, and the prodigious historical performances of Tiraboschi and Quadrio are harbingers of modern critical method. Finally, with the rise of the 'natural' school, the enthusiasm for early popular poetry, and the romantic interest in Ossian we find ourselves in an era of more sympathetic historical perception and deeper philosophical appreciation of the nature of the epos. As a whole, it may be said that the epic criticism of the century was purified by a truer classicism, strengthened by an historical method, and made vital by romantic appreciation.

As illustrative of these tendencies the more important critics of the period may be commented upon briefly. The works of Crescimbeni and Baretti — concerned with the Arcadians — have been sufficiently noted above (§ 3, III, C). They are more important for lyric than for epic criticism. L. A. Muratori, in his Della perfetta poesia italiana, etc. (Modena: 1706), bases his epic criticism upon the poet's office in presenting a poetic or inner reality by means of possible and probable materials. His adverse criticism of Homer, whom nevertheless he admires, and of Ariosto and the romantic epic, is based upon their use of the supernatural. Tasso is the greatest epic poet. Dante he praises, but, as was the fashion, blames for scholastic pedantry and obscurity. G. Gravina's Della ragion poetica (Roma: 1708) is noteworthy for its protest against false Aristotelianism and its critical enthusiasm for the older poets. "Homer he places above all other poets, and his admiration for Dante, to whom he devotes several chapters, is genuine. But the cloven hoof appears in his strange enthusiasm for Trissino." Ariosto is rated above Tasso. Scaliger's criticism of Homer is rejected. Is Gravina's contention that Aristotle's rules are not universally valid applicable to Aristotle's criticism of the epic? Consider the nature of Gravina's fundamental poetic principle — *ragion*, or imitative invention — and his statement that Homer is the greatest poet because he is most natural in his inventions. Among the critical distinctions for which Gravina is more or less famous may be mentioned his assertion, directed against former critics, that the heroes of the epic should be neither perfect nor thoroughly bad, since characters are naturally neither. In his insistence upon the moral function of poetry Gravina is not at his best. For an interesting comparison of Homer and Virgil and of the Greek and Roman genius, see the author's De Disciplina Poetarum (1712). Vico (cf. below, § 11), the earliest of the 'higher critics' of Homer, emphasized the historical and philosophical character of the poet, and interpreted myth as a poetic transformation of history by religious ideas. In the Iliad he saw an illustration of this process. He detected signs that led him to believe that the Homeric poems belonged to different ages, and he proceeded to question the traditional authorship of the poems. He broached the highly doubtful theory of folk authorship of the Homeric epics. But, at any rate, he saw them as great social poems, summing up the actual ideals of the heroic age. And in this idea Vico anticipated the central conception of modern criticism of the epos. Vico's utterances are scattered through his various works. Professor Saintsbury gives the chief *loci* (Hist. Crit., 3: 152–157; see especially the references to the De Constantia Jurisprudentis (1721), and the first (1725) and second (1730) editions of the Scienza nuova; cf. Flint's Vico, Edinb.: 1884; cf. also D'Aubignac as noted below). G. C. Becelli's work (Della novella poesia, etc., Verona: 1732; for the epic see Lib. II, Dante) as a whole is an exposition of the nature of original Italian poetry as distinguished from Italian imitations of the classics. The *romanzi*, thus differentiated from the Greek epos, he defends.

> Like Gravina, he admired Dante, but he considered him to be far from perfect, and hoped that Italian poetry would ultimately advance far beyond him. This growing interest in the great Tuscan, for all its limitations, is one of the most hopeful signs of the coming revival. Appreciation of Dante in Italy, like that of Shakespeare in England, is the surest test of the healthiness of the taste of the day (Collison-Morley, p. 74).

Scipione Maffei (Delle traduzioni italiane, 1736) rates Homer and Virgil as the great masters of the epic, with special preference for the former; in classical hexameters, free of rhyme, he sees a natural, vital instrument of epic expression. For Quadrio's great literary encyclopedia (1739) see above, §§ 2, 8. For another defense of Homer see A. M. Ricci's Dissertationes Homericae (1740). Among the papers of Antonio Conti (printed in 1756) is an essay De' fantasmi poetici, in which occur some acute reflections upon the proper handling of the marvellous. S. Bettinelli's forgotten attack upon Dante for non-observance of epical 'rules,' and his strange preference for Pope's Essay on Man to the Divina Commedia, are in the once famous Lettere dieci di Virgilio agli Arcadi (1757). See also the same author's Lettere inglesi, which contain a reply to Gasparo Gozzi's defense of Dante, Giudizio degli antichi poeti sopra la moderna censura di Dante (1758; ed. A. Galassini, Modena: 1893). Though Gozzi's defense took the mistaken course of defending the 'correctness' of Dante, yet it marked "the turning of the tide, and henceforth Dante begins to take his proper place in Italian literature" (Collison-Morley, 79). In the works of Melchior Cesarotti some surprisingly good criticism exists side by side with surprisingly blind conclusions. His epic criticism suffers primarily from the lack of clear realization of the peculiarities of the epic age. In the preface to his translation of Ossian (1st ed. 1763; cf. the 2d ed. 1772, to which are added translations of Macpherson and Blair on Ossian) Fingal and Homer are compared, and to the former is attributed supremacy in sublimity, tenderness, imagination, characterization. Hence Homer cannot serve as the sole basis for epic 'rules.' Cesarotti's vast learning is apparent in his Homeric studies, consisting of prose and verse translations of the Iliad together with introductions and notes. His Storia della riputazione d' Omero is valuable for purposes of research because of its extensive citation of ancient and modern notices of Homer. In a Storia della persona e delle opere d' Omero he rejects Vico's conception of folk composition and D'Aubignac's theory of poetic aggregation on grounds of aesthetic unity and effect, using arguments similar to those later advanced by Andrew Lang against the modern German school of Homeric criticism. He notices Wood's theory (see below, § 12) and argues against it. He disagrees with Blackwell's suggestion that Homer's supremacy was due to a favorable environment, holding that this supremacy has not been proved and that other and far different environments have produced equally great epic poets, — Ariosto, Tasso, Voltaire, and Ossian. Thus, any age may bring forth a Homer. The old respect for Homer as the source of the arts and of ethics is ridiculed, and his claim to distinction is based, rather, on his position as father of the epic. In Tiraboschi's great Storia della letteratura italiana (13 vols. Modena: 1771–82; 2d ed. enlarged, 16 vols., 1787–94) is much material *à propos* of the Italian epics. Pietro Metastasio's Estratto dell' Arte Poetica d' Aristotele (1784; written earlier) is memorable for a passage on the unity of the Iliad to the effect that after all there are no universally applicable rules for poetry, but that experience and sober good-sense must often point the way. In another of the encyclopedic works of the age — Giovanni Andres' Dell' origine, progressi e stato attuale d' ogni letteratura (1785–1822) — the student will find much upon the epic from Homer to Klopstock. Here again Virgil is given first place; the notices of Homer, Apollonius of Rhodes, Virgil, Ariosto, Tasso, *et al.* are after the usual fashion of contemporary criticism.

D. *Nineteenth Century.*

For apparatus see above, § 3, III, D. There is no satisfactory guide to the epic criticism of the century. Mazzoni, Flamini, and Collison-Morley are most helpful. Finsler mentions only Monti and Foscolo. In Mazzoni see Chapters III, VI, VIII, and the corresponding bibliographical sections.

The criticism of this century is primarily, and especially from 1860 on, historical and psychological in character. To gain an idea of the definitions of the epic, of the function and technique of the epic as conceived by the critics of the period, it is necessary to glean in works of historical criticism (such as those by Pio Rajna, Comparetti, Bartoli, D' Ancona, and the volumes of the Storia letteraria d' Italia scritta da una società di professori), and in the numerous collections of historical and appreciative essays, great in number and very varied in subject (see essays by Mazzini, Tommasèo (see especially his Dell' epopea, in Inspirazione e arte; Firenze: 1858, pp. 85–108), Settembrini, De Sanctis, Monaci, D' Ovidio, D' Ancona, Carducci, Zumbini, Arturo Graf, *et al.*). Articles on Homer by Foscolo and Monti may be found in the former's Esperimento di traduzione della Iliade di Omero (1807). — Special attention must of course be paid to the great Dante literature of the 19th century. The multiplication of editions, commentaries, and dissertations constitutes the main body of Italian epic criticism — historical and literary — of the period. Foscolo's Discorso sul testo della Divina Commedia (published 1842 by Mazzini) is spoken of as inaugurating a criticism "at last worthy of the thought and the name of Dante." Foscolo "is the first Italian," according to Collison-Morley, "to carry out Vico's theory, to consider a work of art as a psychological phenomenon and look for its motive in the author's mind and surroundings" (Mod. Ital. Lit., p. 172). — The heterogeneous mass of criticism in the literary periodicals (see Appendix for a list) must also be sifted.

Most of this material, because of its predominantly historical character, is noted below, §§ 11, 12; and to those sections the student who is in search of the critical opinion of this age must turn.

VI. **French.**

A. *To the Close of the Sixteenth Century.*

For general apparatus see above, § 3, IV, A, B. The most helpful accounts of epic criticism will be found in Spingarn, Lit. Crit. in Renaissance, 1st ed., pp. 210–213; Finsler, Homer in der Neuzeit, pp. 119–138; and Saintsbury, Hist. Crit., vol. II, Book IV, Chap. IV. Quadrio and Blankenburg offer much bibliographical material.

If Scaliger's work belongs to Italian rather than French criticism, it may be said that no full, detailed, systematic French treatment of the epic is to be found previous to the seventeenth century. The French idea of the epic, even as late as Boileau, is vague and general, — a long narrative, upon a great, poetic scale, of significant events. — The beginnings of Gallic criticism — formal observations upon versification, known as the *Seconde Rhétorique* — have already been noted (see above, § 3, IV, A). For the epic attitude of the school immediately preceding the Pléiade see pp. lvii–lxix of Pellissier's introduction to his edition of Vauquelin de la Fresnaye's Art Poétique (Paris: 1885).

Not until the classical renaissance of the Pléiade (cf. above, § 6, VII, G) do we come upon significant notices of the epic. Part of the object of this school was the imitation of the classical genres, and nothing was more coveted by its adherents than a French poem built upon the classical epic model. Joachim Du Bellay in his La deffence et illustration de la langue françoyse (1549, Bk. II, Chap. V, Du long poëme françoys; critical ed. by H. Chamard, Paris: 1904; cf. the Œuvres complètes, ed. Léon Séché, 2 vols., Paris: 1903–07, vol. I, p. 53 ff.), which was the manifesto of the school, desiderates a French Iliad and Aeneid of the deeds of Lancelot, Tristan, and other heroes of romance. His conception of Homer, however, is quite uncritical and unhistorical. There is nothing of value in the Épistre au Seigneur Jean de Morel (1552) placed at the head of Du Bellay's translation of two books of the Aeneid; it may be found in the Œuvres choisies, ed. L. Séché, Paris: 1894. Jacques Pelletier du Mans, in a vague chapter on the epic, which should be compared with Vida's utterances, ranks this as the greatest of literary kinds, as the ocean in comparison to which other types are rivers. Note also his adverse criticism of Ariosto, and a comparison of Homer and Virgil which follows the general line of Italian Virgil-worship and depreciation of Homer. See the second book of Pelletier's Art Poétique (1555), in the Œuvres poétiques de Pelletier, ed. Léon Séché (Paris: 1904). Rücktäschl summarizes Pelletier upon the epic, p. 18 of his Einige Arts poétiques, etc. (Leipz.: 1889). See also the preface, Au Très Chrestien Roy, etc., to Pelletier's translations from the Odyssey (1547); cf. the Homeric translations of Hugues Salel (1545) and Amadis Jamyn (1574), for which see Finsler. In good time Ronsard wrote the epic desired by his 'Brigade,' and it was hailed as a masterpiece. But the chief of the Pléiade had no reasoned theory of the epic. He conceived it as a long, martial poem narrating renowned events of a somewhat remote past, with an action lasting not more than one year. In the prefaces to his epic, La Franciade, 1572, 1587 (see, for the second preface, vol. III, pp. 7–39, of the Œuvres Complètes, ed. P. Blanchemain, 8 vols., Paris: 1857–67), he discusses for the most part minor points of diction, metre, style, and subject, everywhere avowing himself an imitator of Virgil. Compare the praise of Homer in the earlier preface. See especially pp. 19, 20–21, 23, 27, ed. cited, for his broader ideas. For full justice to the prefaces see Saintsbury, Hist. Crit., 2: 122–125; on Ronsard's work, Brunetière, Hist. de la litt. fr. classique, I, 2d part (Paris: 1905), and references above, § 6, VII, G. In 1573 'divine' Du Bartas published his Judith, an epical version of the Apocryphal story, with a preface in which he proclaims his desire to imitate Virgil and Homer. In 1578 appeared his La Sepmaine ou Création du Monde, which became extremely popular (for influence upon English letters, see A. H. Upham, French Influence in English Literature, Chap. IV). In 1583 appeared a portion of another Sepmaine. Du Bartas was a follower of the Pléiade in matters of style and in the general aim of importing the classical types into French literature, but he was dissatisfied with the pagan subjects of ancient epic. His utterances to this effect and his remarks upon the machinery of a Christian epic (see the prefaces) constitute a slight variation from the general run of the Brigade's epic notices. Study of the enthusiastic reception of Du Bartas' work and of the later reaction against it, when it came to be regarded, because of its stylistic excesses, as a typical product of the exaggerated taste of the Pléiade, will help to render vivid and realistic the criticism of this century. For an interesting eulogy from Spontanus, the commentator on Homer, see Finsler, p. 131; further guidance may be found in Petit de Julleville, Tilley's Lit. of the French Renaissance, and G. Pellissier's La vie et les œuvres de Du Bartas (1883). Vauquelin de la Fresnaye (L'Art Poétique, begun in 1574, but not published until 1605) glorifies Homer and Virgil (I, 11, 413 ff.), giving Virgil first place (II, 297) as was the habit in the sixteenth century, remarks upon the inclusiveness of epic subject-matter, goes into details like Ronsard, labors under the usual moral misconception (II, 465. Cf. Horace, Ep. I, ii), believes epic covers all other kinds, comments upon the supernatural, and concludes with some saws upon epic metre. See also II, 87 ff. (cf. Horace, 136–142; Vida, II, 30 ff.; Boileau, III, 268 ff.), 253 (unity of time as one year, cf. Ronsard, Aristotle, v, 3, and Voltaire as cited above, under § 8), and 289 ff. Rücktäschl gives (p. 29) the substance of Pierre de Laudun on the epic (from L'Art poétique français, 1598). On Scaliger, who introduced the Aristotelian conception of the epic into French criticism, and whose Poetics (1561) was published in France, see above, v, under Italian criticism of the epic; also above, § 8.

B. *The Seventeenth Century.*

For references on the trend of poetics in this period, including the "Ancient and Modern Quarrel," see above, § 3, IV, C. Vial and Denise are of particular aid in tracing epic criticism, but Finsler (pp. 149–212) and Blankenburg offer the most comprehensive assistance. On the mania for epic writing that distinguished the century, and for critical material contained in the prefaces to these epics, see J. Duchesne, Histoire des poèmes épiques français du 17^e siècle (Paris: 1870; noted below, § 11), and below, § 12, V, E.

Since French writers of this century were devoted to the manufacture of epic poems (see below, § 12, V, E), they were naturally curious concerning the 'rules' of epic composition. Needless to say the pseudo-classicism of the period conceived the nature of the epic in a formal, conventional, and thoroughly unhistorical spirit. The peculiar social and national relations or functions of the epic, its expressiveness of a certain stage of civilization, and its unique methods of growth were not recognized as differentiating it from other narrative poems. It was still regarded as a long dignified verse narrative, dealing largely with the marvellous, and deriving its subject from remote antiquity, or from more modern history mixed with fiction. Critics still commonly believed, following or at least misinterpreting a suggestion in Horace, that the ancient epics were undertaken as a means of moral and patriotic teaching, and that the fictions of the gods were intended as allegories for the pleasanter conveyance of this teaching. Under the influence of these conceptions, Chapelain, Scudéry, Desmarets, Le Moyne, and Perrault concocted in the library monotonous, stilted, highly artificial, and prolix poems with which they vainly and naïvely hoped to rival the Iliad.

In these umbratic endeavors academic talent welcomed the aid of specific rules and recipes. French criticism now profited not only from its acquaintance with Horace and a fairly intimate knowledge of Aristotle, but also from extensive study of the Italian critics of the previous century. Scaliger's Poetics exerted a definite, direct, and commanding influence. And hence it is that the French epic criticism of the 17th century is more concerned with large questions of style, subject, plot, unities, character, decorum, and machinery than was the previous century. Here as elsewhere the propriety of employing Christian marvels was debated. And pagan marvels — gods and their miracles — should they be used in Christian epics? To such discussions the Ancient and Modern Quarrel added the question of the possibility of transcending in modern times the achievements of Homer and Virgil.

This formal criticism appears at its best in Boileau, and in its extreme (not seldom of absurdity) in Le Bossu. Their work stands at the height of the French 'classical' theory of the epic. Boileau's attempt to ground the rule and recipe, drawn from the practice of the ancients, in reason and in the very nature of poetry, as well as his caustic denunciation of the contemporary epics, especially that of Chapelain, is, indeed, of high importance. To be sure his objection to contemporary epics grew largely from his objection to the use of Christian machinery (God, Satan, archangels, demons, etc.); nevertheless, here, as in all his criticism, Boileau displayed a balance of judgment and a measure of common sense that were liberative if not inspiring.

The formalism of the age utters itself (cf. the previous century and the corresponding period in Italian criticism) most blatantly in frequent objections to the barbarism and indecorum of Homer. Some believed that Homer's culinary realism and his vulgar references to the lower animals were to be attributed in part to the roughness of his age. Bayle and Saint-Évremond thought that had Homer lived in a more refined society — such as their own — he would have produced a 'far more perfect' poem! Boileau, however, and others, including Mercier at the end of the next century, averred that French critics failed to appreciate Homer because they read him in very poor translations.

Perhaps the most original criticism was that which aimed to distinguish the epic from the novel (*roman*) — see Scudéry and Huet. And, whatever suggestions he may have received from the Italians, Chapelain's clear doctrine of the limits of Aristotle's epic criticism was both sane and progressive. Here, as in Italy and England, the theory of the epic begins to be original when a critic attempts to compare classical 'rules' with the practice of the new narrative types of romance and novel.

The critical work of Le Bossu and the 'epic' poem of Chapelain may be said to mark the high tide of pseudo-classical epic theory. The next century witnessed the ebb of that tide. But coincident with the climax of this formalism arose a new method of criticism. This, the historical, took the form of questioning the validity of the tradition of Homeric authorship and of attempting to frame hypotheses of multiple authorship, bardic invention, oral transmission, later reduction to written form, collection of separate lays into epic aggregates, etc. While the historical methods of Bacon and Descartes were making their way and substituting for the old theological dogma of original perfection the new idea of progress from the simple to the complex, the less to the more perfect, literary criticism was beginning to turn from the dogmatic formality of pseudo-classicism to revolutionary speculations about literary growth, epic development, variety of authorship. To be sure the new critical activity had its inception in a specific query about Homer, and was not generalized into a theory of epic evolution until later. But the utterances of Rapin, Perrault, and Boileau upon the Homeric question, and the famous Conjectures of D'Aubignac (written by 1664; published 1715) were the forerunners of modern historical criticism. And perhaps it may be maintained that in a way the quarrel of the Ancients and Moderns was a medium by which the new philosophy of progress and the new spirit of historical, inductive inquiry found their way into poetic criticism. For it was in support of the Moderns' attempt to show the progress of modern beyond ancient art that D'Aubignac wrote and that Perrault in his Parallèle attacked the Homeric tradition, suggesting that the Iliad and Odyssey were but a heap of smaller poems put together at a late period. In such polemic the newer criticism was born. While formalism ebbed historical criticism set toward its far later flood-tide.

The references on the Homeric question have been placed below, § 12, under the historical treatment of the epic. At this point we may add references to some of the more important works of formal criticism that appeared during the century.

For indiscriminate praise of Ronsard and the Franciade, see Book VIII (1611?), Chaps. VII, XI, of Étienne Pasquier's Les recherches de la France (Paris: 1560+). Antoine Godeau, in a Discours de la poésie chrestienne (1635), urges the use of scriptural themes. Pierre Mambrun's De Poemate Epico (Dissertatio Peripatetica de Epico Carmine), published in 1652, is a quaint, typical expression of pseudo-classical naïveté and Aristotelianism. For a summary of Mambrun's delectations see Saintsbury, Hist. Crit., 2: 266–268; cf. Irving Babbitt, The New Laokoon (N.Y.: 1910), pp. 3, 21, 74 ff. On Le Père Le Moyne's Traité du poème héroïque, prefixed to his Saint-Louis (1653), see Sulzer, *op. cit.* § 8, vol. II, pp. 505–507. M. A. de Saint-Amant in the preface to the Moyse sauvé (1653) differentiates his poem, which he modestly calls an heroic idyl, from the epic as regards subject and unity. G. de Scudéry's preface to Alaric (1654) is one of the most orderly and readable of the notices of the time. The critic relies, as he tells us, on Aristotle and Horace, and after them on Macrobius, Scaliger, Tasso, Castelvetro, Piccolomini, Vida, Vossius, Pazzi, Riccoboni, Robortelli, Paolo Beni, Mambrun, *et al.*, as well as upon all the great epics themselves as models. See also the preface to Ibrahim, ou l'illustre Bassa (1641), written by Mlle. Scudéry, but published under the name of her brother. In this preface there is a hint of such a differentiation of the unity of the novel (*roman*) and the epic as is found in Hurd's Letters on Chivalry and Romance (see below, VII, C). Compare Huet, below. H. Racan's Lettre à Chapelain touchant la poésie héroïque, Oct. 25, 1654, gives a touch of the more intimate criticism of the time. Cf. L. Arnould, Racan (Paris: 1896). The criticism of Jean Chapelain is of considerable importance. In the preface to La Pucelle (1656) the departure from precedent in choosing a heroine as the subject of an epic poem is defended at some length (cf. Le Moyne on this point); in briefer form the author treats of his avoidance of the magical elements in the old romantic forms of the story, and of his attempt to follow Virgil's clearness and sanity of judgment in style and general treatment. Boileau's criticism of La Pucelle, in the burlesque Chapelain décoiffé, can hardly be said to have added to the theory of the epic. The student should also consult the preface to Les douze derniers chants du poème de La Pucelle (Ed., H. Herluison and R. Kerviler. Orléans: 1882). In

La lecture des vieux romans (Ed., A. Feillet. Paris: 1870), Chapelain shows to most advantage. He observes that Aristotle's Poetics is in many ways foreign to the manners and ideas of the age of the romances, and that therefore an accommodation of the one to the other is necessary. A hint of the same idea occurs in the preface to La Pucelle. In this way Chapelain's knowledge of the old French romances — a knowledge very rare for his age — resulted in a recognition of those limits to Aristotle's criticism that Castelvetro and Cintio (see above, § 8, under Pigna) had already observed. One must remember, however, that Chapelain was well acquainted with his Castelvetro, and with Italian criticism in general, and that he well may have got his ideas from them, rather than from the romances themselves. At any rate, his copious reading of the romances must have made him aware of the justness of the Italian's observation. Indeed, he goes so far as to aver that the chief difference between Homer and the Lancelot is one of expression and style only. His treatment of the marvellous is also worthy of notice. For the rest of Chapelain's criticism of the epic see the Discours sur le poëme épique, which was placed at the head of the 1623 edition of Marini's Adone (Ed., Bovet, in Aus roman. Sprachen und Lit., Festgabe f. H. Morf. Halle: 1905), and which maintained that Marini had discovered a new type of epic, — the epic of a peaceful age (for summary see Finsler, 155–157). Chapelain's Lettres (Ed., Tamizey de Lorroque. Paris: 1880–83) may be consulted for a general view of the criticism of the time, as may also the letters of J. Guez de Balzac (Œuvres, 1665). Compare Bourgoin, as above, and Saintsbury, Hist. Crit., 2: 257–261. The critical works of J. Desmarets de Saint-Sorlin to be considered are: the Avis to Clovis (1657); Esther, Épître au Roi (1670); La comparaison de la langue et de la poésie française avec la grecque et la latine, et des poètes grecs, latins et français (1670); Disc. pour prouver que les sujets chrétiens sont les seuls propres à la poésie héroïque (1673); La défense du poème héroïque (1674). In the Avis to Clovis, the *roman* and the epic are differentiated according to their employment of the marvellous, and it is pointed out that though the subject of the epic may be taken from history, the poet is not an historian, but the master of time rather than its scribe. The Défense and the Épître agree with Scudéry and Ch. Perrault in defending the use of Christian marvels. See Boileau to the contrary. The defense of the Christian epic is conducted at length in the Traité pour juger des poètes grecs, latins et français (a revision of the Comparaison of 1670), which may be found appended to the 3d ed. of the Clovis. See especially §§ xi, xii, xvi–xviii, xxii, xxix, xxx, xxxiii. Desmarets' espousal of the cause of the Moderns and his fault-finding with the Ancients (see §§ xi and xii of the last reference), his strong advocacy of Christian subjects against the pagan 'matters' (cf. Tasso), and his actual performance in the epic, make him one of the most important contributors to the epic criticism of the time. With Desmarets' slashing of Homer and Virgil compare Tassoni, Beni, and Rapin. M. de Marolles, Traité du poëme épique (1662), — unattainable by the authors. In 1662 Racine wrote certain Remarques sur l'Odyssée d'Homère, which were not published until 1825 (see the Œuvres, Paris: 1888, VI, 56). For an excellent appraisal of Racine's appreciation of Homer — regarded by many as the truest appreciation of the century — see Finsler, pp. 152–154. Note particularly Racine's love of Homer's simplicity and his defense of the "vulgar and common" in the Odyssey, — a defense based on false grounds to be sure, but nevertheless in striking and refreshing contrast to that narrow prudery of the period which repeatedly accused Homer of coarseness and lack of decorum (cf. Desmarets, Perrault, Lamotte, *et al.*). From J. R. de Segrais' preface to his Traduction de l'Énéide (1668) Dryden borrowed in writing his Dedication of the Aeneis (1697). P. D. Huet, in the first part of his De l'origine des romans (prefixed to the Zayde of de Segrais and the Comtesse de Lafayette, 1670), distinguished the epic from the romance as regards subject and manner of treatment. Clara Reeve has expressed her opinion of the treatise in these words of Shakespeare: "His remarks are two grains of wheat in two bushels of chaff, you shall search for them a whole day, and when you have found them they are not worth your labor" (Progress of Romance, p. 91). For N. Boileau-Despréaux, his L'Art poétique (1674), and his other critical works — the most important of the period — see above, § 8. Cf. V. Delaporte, L'art poétique de Boileau commenté par ses contemporains (Lille: 1888). R. Rapin (1674): see above, § 8, and Gayley and Scott, p. 433. R. P. Le Bossu (1675): see above, § 8. C. de La Rue put out an annotated edition of Virgil in 1675, etc.; this is the Ruaeus whom Dryden accused of using Pontanus without proper acknowledgment. A. Dacier's Remarques critiques sur les Œuvres d'Horace, avec une nouvelle traduction (7 vols. Paris: 1683–1697) may be searched for remarks upon epic poetry as well as other types. Bernard de Fontenelle (Dialogues des morts anciens, 1683, Dialogue V, Homère, Ésope) ridicules the mystical and allegorical interpretation of Homer, — a sane utterance in the midst of a mania. In his Digression sur les Anciens et les Modernes (1688), Fontenelle, as one of the chiefs of the Moderns, contends that in the *ordonnance* of the epic poem the Moderns may yet surpass Virgil; "and our romances, which are poems in prose, already make us aware of the possibility." Again, repeating a common idea of the Moderns, he observes that modern poets have an advantage over Homer because they can profit by the rules of the epic laid down since his performance, and because the licenses of the poet have been much restricted in the interests of a purer taste. See the Œuvres Diverses, 3 vols., 1728, vol. II, pp. 132, 135. For the relation of the *roman* to the epic, see the Description de l'empire de la poésie, 1678, vol. IX, p. 269, of the 12-vol. ed. of the Œuvres, Amsterdam: 1764. On Fontenelle see L. Maigron, Fontenelle (Paris: 1906), pp. 180–213. A. Baillet's Jugements des savants sur les principaux ouvrages des auteurs (1685–86) is an interesting compilation, including critical opinions of various epics. The Abbé Dominique Bouhours, in his La manière de bien penser dans les ouvrages d'esprit (1687–88; 1st ed. 1683?), contributes nothing to the criticism of literary kinds, but may be consulted for short general criticisms of Homer, Virgil, Tasso, and Ariosto (see Index). In the first dialogue the relations of truth and fiction, especially in the epic, are briefly discussed (pp. 10–12; cf. also pp. 138, 184, 185. Refs. to the second ed., 1688). One may compare G. G. Orsi, Considerazioni sopra La Maniera di ben pensare nei componimenti già pubblicata dal P. Bouhours (Modena: 1745); G. Doncieux, Un jésuite homme de lettres: le Père Bouhours (Paris: 1886). An English translation of Bouhours' work (The Art of Criticism, etc., "by a person of quality") appeared in London, 1705. Bossuet's utterances upon the epic — his keen appreciation of Homer, his realization that the Homeric gods were religious realities rather than allegorical figures, his statement that Homer's poetry was to Greece what the stories of Jehovah and his angels were to the Hebrews, his opposition to the employment of pagan deities in modern epics, and his adumbration of a glorious Christian epic — may be traced by means of the references collected by J. Duchesne, Hist. des poèmes épiques français du 17^e^ siècle (Paris: 1870), p. 305. Perrault's Saint-Paulin is a painful anti-climax to the great sentences in which Bossuet sketches the epic glories of the Christian faith. Charles Perrault, the other chief of the Moderns, argues for the supremacy of modern poetry and defends the use of Christian marvels. See his famous Parallèles des Anciens et des Modernes (1688–98) and the Épître dédicatoire à Bossuet of his Saint-Paulin (1686). On Perrault and others in the Ancient and Modern battle see the references given at the head of this division. The list of pamphlets is long, the results of research meagre. In Jean Le Clerc's Parrhasiana (1699) is a reply to Le Bossu and others who maintained the didactic aim of the epic. Le Clerc, like Plato, objected to the moral improprieties of Homer, and asserted that the epic poets made a practice of teaching morality only so far as it might serve as poetic embellishment. The work of Saint-Évremond is noted above, § 8.

C. *The Eighteenth Century.*

For apparatus on the general trend of criticism see above, § 3, IV, D. Blankenburg and Vial-Denise are of particular aid in tracing criticism of the epic; Finsler is still the chief guide for Homeric criticism. On the Ancient and Modern Quarrel see above, § 3, IV, C.

In the eighteenth century the student will observe the further ebb of pseudo-classic formalism, and the gradual rise, under the influence of historical criticism and Rousseau's return-to-nature movement, of a more natural and unaffected appreciation of the national epics of antiquity, especially of the simplicity of Homer (cf. Finsler, p. 241). Epic criticism is ushered in by a recrudescence of the Ancient and Modern Quarrel, — the Lamotte-Dacier controversy on the merits of the classical ideal as represented by Homer. The old charges of barbarism, lack of decorum and propriety, inconsequence of plot, monotony of style, etc., are reiterated, and repelled with much abuse of the allegers (see Mme. Dacier). The defense involves, to be sure, not only the old allegorical explaining-away of defects, but even stranger interpretations, such as those of Père Hardouin — which we shall meet later. It is, however, replete with sincere, passionate enjoyment of Homeric poetry: the very abandon is a sign of critical change. There developed from the quarrel a conviction that the nature of the epic must vary with changes in social and national conditions, and that, therefore, the formal 'rules' must give way to new principles born of new times. Declarations of aesthetic independence of the *Regelzwang* began to be plentiful, and there was almost a tendency to make mere expressiveness the test of poetic excellence (see Boivin, Dubos, and others). With Voltaire, Dubos, and Marmontel the break with Le Bossu and the pseudo-classic conception of the epic widened. They haled artificial formalism to the pillory of common sense. Voltaire himself reached an extreme in maintaining that the only *sine qua non* of an epic was that it should narrate in verse heroic adventures.

Of the old moot questions of epic theory, that of the employment of Christian and pagan marvels showed some vitality. A representative list of the various decisions may be found in Vial et Denise, pp. 299–300, *et seq.* Other stock problems still walked, and may be met in most of the critical works from Mme. Dacier to La Harpe. But with the turn to historical criticism — to the attempt to conceive the Iliad and Odyssey as their original audience understood them, and to the arguments against unity of authorship (see D'Aubignac, Dubos, Mercier, and others) — many ghosts began to be 'laid.' Historical inquiry and aesthetic independence developed side by side in preparation for the *éclaircissement* of the next century.

In 1700 Régnier-Desmarais published a translation of the first book of the Iliad, to which he prefixed a Dissertation sur quelques endroits d'Homère. For A. Houdar de Lamotte, see P. Dupont, Un poète-philosophe au commencement du dix-huitième siècle (Paris: 1898), pp. 117–301, — a rather one-sided affair; B. Jullien, Les paradoxes littéraires de Lamotte, etc. (Paris: 1859), pp. 181–424. See Lamotte's verse translation and abbreviation of the Iliad (1714), that "étrange entreprise," as Voltaire called it (Dict. Philos., Art. Épopée), "de dégrader Homère, et de le traduire." Lamotte endeavored to correct the 'barbaric' Homer according to French, or rather his own, taste. In a Discours sur Homère, prefixed to the translation, Lamotte laid bare the indecorums of Homer. "I have taken the liberty," he says, "to change what I thought disagreeable in it [the Iliad]." At the same time he inveighs against many of the 'rules,' including Aristotle's remarks upon unity of action. To please is the poet's aim. He may choose any method that does please. Rules shall not bind him. Lamotte is a heretic among classicists (cf. Fontenelle). He incurred the disapproval of the learned Mme. Dacier (Des causes de la corruption du goût, 1714), to whom he replied in his witty Réflexions sur la critique (1715). One may also consult the Discours sur la poésie (1707). Mme. Dacier's criticism, to which reference has just been made, was undertaken in a spirit of horror and outrage at the desecration of Homer, and at the anarchy of the desecrator. She idolized Homer. She had assumed the mission of improving the French understanding of him by supplying adequate translations of his poems. In prefaces she had expressed her devotion and called the French nation to worship. And she had adopted with the rapt spirit of an initiate the epic dogmas of the pseudo-classicists (see further, above, § 8). Her bitter polemic against Lamotte is the Ancient and Modern Quarrel revived. Of quaint interest is Jean-François de Pons' Lettre à M——, sur l'Iliade de M. de la Motte (1714). See also the Dissertation sur le poème épique, contre la doctrine de M. D—— [Dacier], and the Observations sur divers points concernant la traduction d'Homère: both in the Œuvres (1738). In the Lettre the Abbé defends the views of Lamotte on the barbarism of Homer, and asserts that Lamotte, by the publication of such views, has done for literature what Descartes had done for philosophy. Fénelon's scattered remarks upon the epic may be found in the Lettre à M. Dacier . . . sur les occupations de l'Académie, 1714, § v, Projet de poétique, and § x, Sur les Anciens et les Modernes; in the literary correspondence with Houdar de Lamotte; and in the Dialogues des morts, IV–VI. All these are contained in the 2d vol. of the Œuvres Choisies de Fénelon (Paris: 1890). Important is l'Abbé Jean Terrasson's Dissertation critique sur l'Iliade d'Homère, etc. (2 vols., 1715. English translation by F. Brerewood, A Critical Diss. upon Homer's Iliad, 2 vols., Lond.: 1722; also a translation by the same, of the Préface, 1716, A Discourse of Ancient and Modern Learning, etc.). Terrasson, a partisan of Lamotte, does not agree with Le Bossu's statement that the moral of the epic must be determined before the subject is chosen, but would have the poet choose for his subject, without regard to the moral, the execution of a great design. He condemns the Iliad for its lack of action.

The Abbé's chief intent is the application of reason, rather than the authority of tradition, to the discussion of literary subjects. The work is really an elaboration of Lamotte's Discours: he has such aversion for Homer that he can scarcely say one complimentary thing about the Iliad and Odyssey. His support of the cause of Lamotte and the Moderns he bases upon a theory of the progress of the human spirit, derived from Descartes; compare Terrasson's La philosophie applicable à tous les objets de l'esprit et de la raison, published 1754, after his death. Replies to Lamotte were issued by Gacon (Homère vengé, published anonymously, 1715) and Jean Boivin (Apologie d'Homère, 1715). Boivin's work is a sane, discriminating exposition of the beauties of Homer, with due acknowledgment of the truth in some of Lamotte's revolutionary statements. Particularly noticeable is the assertion that the most effective part of a poem is not its basic idea or its didactic purpose, but the beauty and euphony of its verses, — another revolutionary remark. Cf. Mém. de Litt. de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles Lettres, 1736, 1: 176. For Saint-Hyacinthe's satirical contributions to the quarrel and Fourmont's "Pacific Examination," see Finsler, pp. 229–230. Père C. Buffier's Homère en arbitrage (1715) attempts a reconciliation between Mme. Dacier and Lamotte by pointing out that after all they concur in discussing Homer as one of the greatest of poets and the Iliad as one of the greatest of poems. D'Aubignac's epochal work on the authorship of the Homeric poems was published in 1715, but was written as early as 1664. Its relation to the quarrels of ancients and moderns has been noted under the 17th century, but its vital influence as a pioneer in the new field of historical epic criticism belongs to this and the next century. The now famous Conjectures académiques ou dissertation sur l'Iliade was published anonymously, and had little immediate recognition. In it D'Aubignac would explain all the imperfections of the Homeric poems, as they had been stated by a long line of critics, as due to multiple authorship and conflicting aims. Too many poets spoiled the broth! There was no Homer, no one poet to give to these poems unity and the impress of one commanding genius. Instead the poems originated in separate rhapsodies in praise of gods, heroes, and royal families. Finally these lays were stitched together with appropriate transitions. Thus was produced the Iliad, bearing in itself evidences of its haphazard and various authorship, which have erroneously been interpreted as the shortcomings of one poet. The development of this theory by German critics — Herder, Heyne, F. A. Wolf, Welcker, and others — has given to the world what is known as the Homeric Question (cf. below, § 12). In 1716 F. Catrou published an annotated translation of Virgil (in 6 vols., Paris), references to which are found in many of the English and French epic criticisms of the 18th century. Père Hardouin, in his strange and often ridiculous Apologie d'Homère, où l'on explique le véritable dessein de son Iliade et sa théomythologie (Paris: 1716), discovers that the real subject of the Iliad is the fall of the house of Priam and that the gods represent human virtues in conflict. Only understand this, says Hardouin, and Homer becomes at once clear and great. The comparison of the manners in the Greek epic with the manners of the Old Testament, although undertaken with a view to throwing an air of dignity if not sanctity about Homeric characters and customs, is nevertheless an anticipation of historical, comparative criticism. Mme. Dacier was scandalized at the nature of the Apologie, and refuted Hardouin's 'discoveries' in a Homère défendu contre l'Apologie du R. P. Hardouin (Paris: 1716). Andrew Michael Ramsay's Discours sur la poésie épique, et l'excellence du poëme de Télémaque (1717 (?), prefixed to Ramsay's ed. of the Télémaque; may be found in the Œuvres de Fénelon, 9 vols., Paris: 1787–92, vol. V, pp. i–xxiv; and in English in many of the early translations of the poem, such as that of Littlebury and Boyer, Lond.: 1728) is a panegyric on the Télémaque, treating the poem under the three main heads of Action, Moral, and Poetry, following Le Bossu in theory, exalting the Christian philosophy of Fénelon and his reticence in dealing with the marvellous, and comparing the French poem favorably with the epics of Virgil and Homer. The Réflexions critiques sur la poésie et sur la peinture, by Abbé Jean Baptiste Dubos, which followed in 1719, is a work of historical and critical acumen. In some respects Dubos might almost be called a forerunner of Croce and the expressionist school of criticism. He holds a brief against the legislative critic who subordinates creative genius to rule and 'reason.' Expressiveness of phrase he exalts above unity of construction, and therefore prefers Ariosto to Tasso. He avers, too, that the judgment of the public is superior to that of the critics. Dubos is possessed of the historical spirit. He notes that the employment of the marvellous should not hinge upon the aesthetic *arbitrium* of a group of critics, but upon the historical question, Did the age represented in the poem concern itself with these marvels? To the mysterious gift of the poet belongs the power of rendering the marvellous probable, but always we should contemplate a poem such as the Iliad from the standpoint of the age of which it is the expression. Its materials and aesthetic form are alike conditioned by its environment, or *milieu*; therefore absolute rules should not be made the measure of the poem, but rather its expressiveness, the degree in which it moves and pleases us. The relation of these views to the Ancient and Modern Quarrel should be noted. For specific remarks upon the epic see vol. I, pp. 176–179 of the 4th ed. (3 vols., Paris: 1740), Quelques remarques sur le poème épique: Observations touchant le lieu et le temps où il faut prendre son sujet. An English translation of Dubos was made by T. Nugent, Critical Reflections on Poetry, Painting, and Music (Lond.: 1748). The study of Dubos as an initiator of modern thought and of his relations to Descartes, Locke, Dryden, and other previous critics and philosophers, is as important as it is interesting. See M. Braunschvig, L'Abbé Dubos (Diss. Paris, Toulouse: 1904); P. Péteut, J. B. Dubos (Diss. Berne, 1902); A. Lombard, L'Abbé Dubos (Diss. Paris, 1913), which contains full bibliography. Charles Rollin, in his Traité des études (4 vols., 1720–31, Liv. III, Chap. I, art. iv), declaims pedagogically against pagan marvels in modern epics. Montesquieu's critical heresies are found chiefly in the youthful Lettres persanes (1721), the Essai sur le goût, published in the Encyclopédie, and the Pensées et fragments inédits in the Collection Bordelaise (2 vols., Bordeaux: 1899–1901). A very convenient guide through this mass of material is furnished by E. P. Dargan's The Aesthetic Doctrine of Montesquieu (Baltimore: 1907). Montesquieu knows little about the epic and seems to believe that the Iliad and the Aeneid (?) are the only true epics, and that it is impossible to produce new ones; of the Iliad and the Odyssey he thinks very highly; upon the quarrel with the ancients he throws ridicule; and against the romances he is exceedingly bitter (see Dargan, pp. 107, 111, 124–129, 134–135, 138). For Voltaire's Essai sur la poésie épique (1728; first written in English, 1726), see above, § 8. In 1729 and 1731 appeared two works on Paradise Lost, C. F. Constantin de Magny's Dissertation critique sur le Paradis Perdu, and Bernard Routh's Lettres critiques sur le P. P. For other references to Milton, of this and the earlier years of the next century, see J. M. Telleen, Milton dans la litt. française (Paris: 1904). Abbé Trublet's Essais sur divers sujets de littérature et de morale (3 vols. 1735–60) contains matter on the epic. From Marmontel, with his faint praise of Boileau and his spiritual communion with Rousseau and Diderot, might be expected some original treatment of the epic, and if the expectation is not well borne out by the performance in the article on the Épopée, 1755 (in Éléments de littérature, 6 vols., 1787,— a collection of articles originally contributed to Diderot's Encyclopédie), there is at least a clear, undeflected following of the Aristotelian principles, with criticism meted out by the way, and in justice and reason, to Le Bossu, Terrasson, and Lamotte. On the choice of subject Marmontel's observations are still of the 'rules' order, but he is not without the grace of occasional doubt. His differentiation of the unity of the epic and the drama according to the nature of the 'opposition' in the two kinds is worthy of notice; so, too, his statement that the subject of the Odyssey is more universal in character than that of the Aeneid, — an idea that would have inflamed mightily the Scaligers of the past. See also his criticism of the Henriade as lacking situations and scenes, and the various comparisons of epic and tragedy that fall under the discussion of the composition of the epic. In the article on the marvellous, also contributed to the Encyclopédie, vol. X, 1765, Marmontel declares for the admission of pagan marvels into modern epics dealing with ancient subjects because of the poetic beauty of the ancient myths. He pronounces the Christian marvels cold and without poetic value. See also the discussion of the marvellous (a philosophical background is added to Dubos' historical arguments), of the pity-and-fear effect of the epic, of the moral but not allegorical character of the fable, of plot construction, etc., etc., in the Poétique française (1763). Denis Diderot would admit neither pagan nor Christian marvels into the modern epic, because neither sort is believable. See his Dorval et moi, 3^{e} Entretien (1757). For his utterances on Homer see Finsler, 243–245. On Diderot see further J. Rocafort, Des doctrines littéraires de l'Encyclopédie (Paris: 1890). In the Mém. de Litt. de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles Lettres, under the year 1760 (30: 539), is a Dissertation sur Homère considéré comme poète tragique, by Chabanon. The paper is a brief note on the dramatic qualities of Homer, set off by contrast with Virgil, and carried to the extreme of confusing the epic and tragic genres. P. J. Bitaubé's Réflexions sur la traduction des poètes (1764), prefixed to his prose translation of the Odyssey, criticizes Mme. Dacier's canon of translation. Les quatre Poëtiques d'Aristote, d'Horace, de Vida, et de Despréaux, by Abbé Charles Batteux (2 vols., Paris: 1771), may profitably be consulted to the following extent: vol. I, Remarques sur Aristote, pp. 199–310 — on Chaps. XXIII–XXVI of Aristotle's Poetics; vol. II, Remarques sur Vida, especially pp. 216–237, on his Poeticorum Lib. II. See also the same author's Cours de belles-lettres ou principes de la littérature

(1753; compiled from Les beaux-arts réduits à un même principe, 1745, and the Cours de belles-lettres, 1750), vol. II, art. iii, L'Épopée: Batteux remarks upon the sublimity and poetic value of Christian wonders, defends Homer against the strictest of the decorous critics and rates him above Virgil in creative power, management of the marvellous, and characterization. For Batteux's definition of the epic see above, § 8. On his influence as a critic see Saintsbury, Hist. Crit., and M. Schenker, Charles Batteux und seine Nachahmungstheorie in Deutschland (Leipz.: 1909; in *Untersuch. zur neueren Sprach- und Litgesch.*, ed. O. Walzel, N. F., 2. Heft). G. B. de Rochefort, in his Discours sur Homère (prefixed to his translation of the Iliad, new ed. Paris: 1772), attempts to expound the Homeric poems, especially with reference to the marvellous, from an historical consideration of their environment (cf. Blackwell), and maintains the superiority of Homer's vital and original handling of the myths to Virgil's conventional and ornamental methods. J. M. B. Clément, in his nine Lettres à M. de Voltaire (4 vols. La Haye: 1773–76), comments upon the general character and influence of Voltaire's literary criticism and (Letters VII–IX) discusses the virtues of epic poetry and the faults of the Henriade. The preface to C. F. Lebrun's "improved" Iliad, which pretends to be an ancient Greek work, represents Homer as defending his poems "with the arguments of Le Bossu and Mme. Dacier" (Finsler, 249). Louis Mercier, in his Contre Homère traduit en français (in Mon bonnet de nuit, 1784), not only reiterates Boileau's complaint that the French translations do not do justice to the Homeric poems, but goes on to argue that the poems are not the production of one poet. Rather they are, in their present form, redactions of earlier poems descending from the rhapsodes (cf. Vico, D'Aubignac, Wood, Blackwell, F. A. Wolf, *et al.*; cf. below, § 12). Madame de Staël, in her Essai sur les fictions, holds a tentative brief against the use of marvellous and allegorical fictions in the epic, and defends the use of "natural fictions" in the novel. The essay was first published in the Recueil de morceaux détachés, 1795:

see the Œuvres, 17 vols., 1820–21, II, 175 ff. The same author's De la littérature considérée dans ses rapports avec les institutions sociales (1800) misses the opportunity, suggested by the main thesis of the work, of differentiating the epic on the basis of its social content. See also the article on Camoens in the Biographie Universelle (vol. XVII of the Œuvres). La Harpe defends Christian wonders, in vol. I, Chap. IV, of his Lycée (1797–98). La Harpe is a classicist of the type prevalent in the early part of the century. A. Chénier's Hermès and his L'Invention afford interesting documents in the study of classical revivals; cf. É. Faguet, André Chénier (Paris: 1902), pp. 101–111.

D. *The Nineteenth Century.*

For apparatus see above, § 3, IV, E. We know of no specific guide to the theoretic epic criticism of this century.

What is said elsewhere of the general tendencies — appreciative, philosophical, historical, scientific — of the criticism of the 19th century need not be repeated here (see above, § 3, IV, E; below, VII, D). The philosophical and historical study of poetry has so fundamentally affected the conception of the epic that the pseudo-classic formal regard of the type has been entirely displaced as confusing and ridiculous. The rise of the new epic criticism in the previous century — from D'Aubignac to Mercier — we have already noted; its continuation in this period demands treatment under our historical section (see below, § 12). To be sure historical research not seldom indulges in appreciative and speculative asides, or in judgments of form and technique, that belong by nature and descent to the criticism we have been tracing in this section; but these asides are scattered and unsystematic. Their collection is as laborious as their character is individual and various. Likewise generally lacking in method are the historical notices of epic poems and poets to be found in the more purely appreciative and aesthetic essays of the century. Lists of such essays may be compiled from the bibliographical aids mentioned above, § 3, IV, E. Babbitt's Masters of Modern French Criticism affords assistance.

The present authors suggest to the student of this field that his first task be the collection of scattered references which they have not supplied, but would welcome.

VII. English.

Apparatus for the general history of English criticism is cited above, § 3, v. G. Finsler's Homer in der Neuzeit (Berlin: 1912), pp. 264–376, is especially and directly helpful in tracing the development of epic criticism from Ascham to Cowper. For a very brief treatment of English epic criticism see Irene Myers' A Study in Epic Development, pp. 24–27 (Yale Studies in English, XI. 1901).

A. *Sixteenth Century.*

See the apparatus given above, § 3, v, A. The chief aids are Finsler, Spingarn (pp. 293–295), and Blankenburg (Art. Heldengedicht); in G. G. Smith's Eliz. Crit. Essays, see vol. I, pp. 14–15, 136–141, 179, 255–262; vol. II, 26, 40–44, 216, 297–307.

Until the appearance of Dryden's essays on epic poetry (1674, 1687; see above, § 8) English criticism of the epic is, from the point of view of original contribution and advance beyond continental sources, well-nigh negligible. Moreover, no references of any importance occur before the last two decades of the 16th century. Until 1580 English criticism is represented by the early Rhetorics (see Gayley and Scott, p. 386): naturally, they contain no criticism of the epic, though in treating of archaisms of language or matter they occasionally animadvert on Chaucer or the Arthurian legends. Roger Ascham, in the first book of the Schoolmaster (1570), takes a fling at the Morte Arthur. In the second book, § 5, indiscriminate imitation of Chaucer is censured, and Virgil's imitation of Homer is cited as an example of what imitation should be. Another early epic *locus* may be found in Thomas Phaer's translation (1558, the year following Surrey's translations) of the first seven books of the Aeneid, to which, in 1562, he added two other books. The translation was completed in 1583 by Thomas Twyne.

After 1580 English criticism is concerned primarily with questions of prosody and with a defense of poetry against the Puritan charges of immorality. Neither subject was of a nature to develop a critical notice of the epic, especially in view of the fact that the defense had to be carried on in favor of the drama rather than the other types. The meagre notices of the last twenty years of the century, in most of which foreign influence (Horace and French and Italian critics) is traceable, may be indicated under four heads. — (*a*) Recognition of the epic, several times, as the highest and noblest form of poetry: this is in sequence with the classical view of the epic *metre* as the weightiest and gravest of metres (cf. Aristotle, Poetics xxiv, 5). (*b*) Brief, 'roll-call' criticisms of the poets, in which a short critical tag was appended to each name in a list of the poets: an ancient device favored by the naïve criticism of the time (see below, Meres and Bolton). The citation is indiscriminate, as though the poets Homer, Virgil, Chaucer, Spenser, Langland, Warner, *et al.* were of the same nature and worth. The conception is a propaedeutic to the later definition, imported from abroad, of the epic as merely a long poem, of heroic subject and sublime style. (*c*) Praise of the epic as historical poetry representing great deeds of the past. The epic, with its high seriousness and its aloofness from the vices of the times, offered to those defending poetry a ready illustration of poetic values. Thus was intensified the moral prepossession for the epic as a valuable medium of moral and allegorical instruction. (*d*) The first distinct reference in English (1591) to the Aristotelian canons of the epic (see Harington).

In 1582 appeared a translation of the Aeneid by Richard Stanyhurst (printed at Leyden). In the Dedication and the Preface Stanyhurst praises the 'decorum' of Virgil, especially the "rare points of hidden secrets sealed up" in the twelve books of the Aeneid. He also discusses Phaer's version at some length. Sir Philip Sidney, in his Defense of Poesie (written between 1581 and 1585; published 1595), recognizes the epic as the noblest form of poetry (cf. Gayley and Scott, p. 391). William Webbe, A Discourse of English Poetrie (1586), has no idea of the epic beyond this, — that it is the highest and best sort of poetry, wherein are displayed the great deeds and characters of the past. He seems to like especially its "braue warlike phrase and bygge sounding kynd of thundring speech." George Puttenham's conception (The Arte of English Poesie. 1589) is similarly naïve; he has some four pages of encomium upon historical poetry. For a censure of Phaer's translation of Virgil, see Thomas Nash's Preface to Greene's Menaphon (1589; in G. G. Smith, Eliz. Crit. Essays, I, 307 ff.). Sir John Harington, in his Brief Apology for Poetrie (1591), undertakes a defense of the Orlando Furioso, in the course of which he briefly refers to the Aristotelian canons (in Smith, II, 216). Spingarn (Lit. Crit. in the Ren., pp. 293–294) asserts that this is the first appearance in English criticism of the Aristotelian theory of the epic. See also Bishop Joseph Hall, Virgidemiarum: Six Books . . . of Toothless Satires (and) . . . Biting Satires (1597–98. Ed. by S. W. Singer, Lond.: 1824. See Bk. I, No. IV; VI, No. I; cf. Gayley and Scott, p. 392); George Chapman, Prefaces (1598. See below, under B). Francis Meres, in his quaint literary comparisons (Palladis Tamia: Comparative Discourse of our English Poets, etc., 1598.—Haslewood, vol. II, pp. 147–158), regards Chaucer, Langland, Spenser, and Warner as the English equivalents of Homer and Virgil.

B. *Seventeenth Century.*

For apparatus see above, § 3, V, B. The chief aids are Finsler, Spingarn (Crit. Essays of 17th Cent.), and Blankenburg. See also G. M. Miller, The Historical Point of View in English Literary Criticism, 1570–1770 (in *Anglistische Forschungen*, vol. XXXV. 1913). Texts may be found in Spingarn, as just noted.

In general, English epic criticism of the 17th century is marked by a rather gradual development, largely under the influence of continental critics, from the naïve notices of the previous century, to a fuller and more sophisticated criticism of a thoroughly formal and conventional kind. Like the estimates of the earlier period, this fuller criticism is entirely of moral function and literary technique, without any basis in historical induction, and without any perception of the peculiar social significance and relationship of the different sorts of epic or various periods of epic development. Formal rules are multiplied and these rules are glossed with great industry. The prevailing conception of the epic is that of the literary sciolist who believes that all that is needed for the production of epics is genius and a book of rules: the age in which the genius may fall is not conceived to have any primary importance, — is not realized as having a determining influence upon the inner nature of the epic poem.

Almost all the tendencies of the criticism of the period come to their head and fullest expression in Dryden's work (see above, § 8), especially in his Discourse on Epic Poetry (1697). In fact, if one desires to suggest the logical units, or epochs, of the development of epic criticism in England, rather than the arbitrary time divisions according to centuries, the first major period will probably extend from the beginning, about 1580, of conventional literary criticism, to Dryden's Discourse, with a possible subdivision at Rymer's translation of Rapin (1674). A more detailed summary of the criticism of the century under the following heads will serve to indicate the relative position of Dryden.

(*a*) The general encomiums of the last two decades continue, as in Chapman, Peacham, and Drayton; but they increase in length and discrimination, until they reach their height in both respects in Dryden's defense of Virgil. (*b*) Early in the century the influence of continental critics is felt. In the 16th century ideas had been pilfered from abroad with little citation or acknowledgment (see G. G. Smith, Eliz. Ess., I, lxxvii ff.). But now Scaliger is cited as well as followed: formal criticism is carried on under such heads as Prudence, Efficacy, Variety, and Sweetness. Horace also is quoted, and Heinsius, and much use is made of the old Horatian term 'Decorum,' which had also appeared in the earlier treatises (see Puttenham's definition of the term in his Arte of English Poesie, Chap. XXIII). In the last quarter of the century Rapin, Boileau, Le Bossu, and Segrais become the chief influences in English critical doctrine. On the importance of Rapin, see Gayley and Scott, p. 433. Dryden, perhaps, shows the reliance on foreign sources more singularly than any of the previous writers on the epic. His work is a surprising cento of conventional opinions and authorities, all expressed and illustrated with that peculiar power of making the possessions of others his own that marks the work of this first of the great English critics. In him the talent of industrious assimilation, which was indeed the distinguishing character of the critics of the 17th century, rises to genius. (*c*) Aristotelian criticism receives recognition in three important works. First, Goulston's edition of the Poetics (1623), of which Professor Bywater has written:

> Goulston's paraphrase, with the marginal commentary which accompanies it, is in a sense the most helpful of the earlier versions, since it is a definite attempt to explain the logical sequence of Aristotle's ideas, and thus to deal with difficulties of a kind of which the sixteenth-century interpreters would seem to have been unconscious (I. Bywater, Aristotle on the Art of Poetry. Oxford: 1909; p. x).

The second recognition appears in Jonson's citation of Aristotelian dogmas in his Timber (1626); the third is manifest in Dryden's use of the Poetics for his Discourse. (*d*) The conception of the epic as embodying a moral philosophy. This is signally exemplified in Milton's high estimate of the nature of poetry: not only the execution of his epics, but his choice of subject, reveals the idealism. Dryden, also, in his dissertation, emphasizes the quality of epical excellence by rating heroic poetry above the drama, thus opposing Aristotle's dictum. (*e*) The notice accorded to Milton's performance, including his use of blank verse, — though scant at first, yet favorable. Dryden, however, in the Essay on Heroic Plays, argues against blank verse. (*f*) The recommendation by Davenant, in 1650, and Cowley, in 1656, of Christian subjects to the epic poet. They are following Tasso's poetics and discourses upon heroic poetry (1587–1594), which were translated into French by Jean Baudoin, 1638 (for the references see the Discorsi, noted above, § 8). In this recommendation Davenant and Cowley are anticipating the Frenchman Desmarets de Saint-Sorlin by several years (see above, under French criticism). So also is Milton in the conception and completion of his epics.

These points may be studied in the following references: William Vaughan (The Golden Grove, 1600; Bk. III, Chap. 42 Of Poetry and the Excellency thereof) cites Homer in his defense of poetry. Thomas Campion, Observations in the Art of English Poesie (1602. Chap. IV): the subject of epic and tragedy is "all one," and the two sorts of poems differ only in "the kind of their numbers." Edward Bolton, Hypercritica (1722. Written in part, probably, between 1600 and 1603; according to Arber, 1620; cf. Gayley and Scott, p. 393. See Address IV, Sec. iii. In Haslewood, II, 220–254): a brief and adverse notice of the English of Chaucer and Spenser. For other 'roll-calls' of the poets, see Spingarn, Crit. Ess., I, xx. Sir Francis Bacon, Advancement of Learning (1605. Bk. II, Sec. iv). Bacon does not use the term epic, but substitutes the wider category of "poesy narrative" as one of the three chief divisions of poetry. This narrative is defined as "a mere imitation of history, with the excesses before remembered (i.e., with a more ample greatness, a more exact goodness, and a more absolute variety than can be found in the nature of things), choosing for subject commonly wars and love, rarely state, and sometimes pleasure or mirth." Cf. Gayley and Scott, § 20, and add to the references cited there the following: E. Flügel, Bacon's Historia Literaria (in *Anglia*, 1899, vol. XXII); P. Jacquinet, Francisci Baconi de Re Litteraria Judicia (Paris: 1863). George Chapman, Prefaces to his translations of Homer (1598–1614 or 1616). The earlier Prefaces (see G. G. Smith, Eliz. Ess., II, 295 ff.) contain a note "on good authoritie" that the books of the Iliad were not set together by Homer himself, and a defense of Homer in which the Greek poet is ranked far above Virgil and Scaliger is roundly taken to task for preferring the latter. In the later Prefaces (1610–1616(?). See Spingarn, Crit. Ess., 67 ff.) is a defense and eulogy of poetry in general and of Homer in particular. Of the Conversations of Ben Jonson and William Drummond of Hawthornden (1619. See Spingarn, Crit. Ess., I, 210 ff.) note especially No. X, in which Jonson is said to have asserted that "for a heroic poem there was no such ground as King Arthur's fiction." H. Peacham, The Compleat Gentleman (1622. Chap. X Of Poetrie): the longest appreciation of a single poem is that of the Aeneid. Peacham summarizes Scaliger (Poetice, III, 24–27), following Scaliger's enumeration of the poet's excellences under the four heads of prudence, efficacy, variety, and sweetness. T. Goulston, Aristotelis de Poetica Liber, Latine Conversus et Illustratus (1623): see above. Ben Jonson, Timber (in course of composition as early as 1626, but not printed until 1641. Ed., F. E. Schelling. Boston: 1892; critical ed. of the text by Maurice Castelain. Paris: 1907). Jonson deals in a strictly Aristotelian fashion with the relative magnitudes of epic and dramatic plots. Compare H. Grossmann, Ben Jonson als Kritiker (Berlin: 1898); H. Reinsch, Ben Jonsons Poetik und seine Beziehungen zu Horaz (Erlangen u. Leipz.: 1899. In *Münchener Beiträge z. roman. u. engl. Philol.*, 16); J. E. Spingarn, The Sources of Jonson's 'Discoveries' (in *Modern Philology*, April, 1905), which shows his borrowings from Heinsius and other continental critics. M. Drayton, in his Epistle to Henry Reynolds, Esq., of Poet and Poesie (1627), praises Chaucer and Spenser, ranking the latter next to Homer. Henry Reynolds (Mythomystes, Wherein a Short Survey is taken of the Nature and Value of true Poesy and Depth of the Ancients above our Modern Poets. 1633(?)) follows Pico della Mirandola (Opera Omnia. Basle: 1572) in interpreting the 'fables' of Homer as mystical allegories of divine wisdom. The same tendency is seen in Bacon's Wisdom of the Ancients. Compare *Spectator*, No. 221. In his Jeremiad over the poets of the moderns, Reynolds excepts, among others, Tasso, Ariosto, and Spenser, because of their "moral philosophy." Sir William Alexander's Anacrisis, or a Censure of some Poets Ancient and Modern (1634(?). Cf. Gayley and Scott, p. 395) is in advance of the usual poets' muster found in Meres, Bolton, Peacham, Drayton, *et al.* Sir William dares to disagree with Scaliger, and to criticize Virgil for picturing Turnus as a coward; finds but one blemish in Tasso; realizes that to the ancients their myths were truths, — not fictions; and "allows that an epic poem should consist altogether of a fiction," but that it "is more agreeable with the gravity of a tragedy that it be grounded upon a true history." A list of the "chief critical *loci* in Milton" will be found in Saintsbury's Hist. Crit. (II, 366, Note), and a reprint of the same in Spingarn's Crit. Ess. (I, 194 ff.). Notice Milton's high and serious conception of poetry — for the greater glory of God and the education of man — and his *obiter dictum* against rhyme in the epic (cf. Gayley and Scott, pp. 395–396). In the Reason of Church Government (1641) is a passage contrasting the "diffuse" epic of Homer, Virgil, and Tasso with the "brief" epic, such as the Book of Job. For Sir William Davenant and Thomas Hobbes (1650), see above, § 8. Hobbes holds that epic and tragedy are the poetry of the court, comedy of the city, pastoral comedy and bucolics of the country. Abraham Cowley (Preface to Poems, 1656) would baptize the epic in Jordan, — substitute Biblical subjects for classical. See also Cowley's notes on the Davideis (cf. Gayley and Scott, p. 397). Thomas Sprat's Account of the Life and Writings of Mr. Abraham Cowley (in the Works of Cowley. 1668) contains a brief eulogy of the Davideis and a defense of Cowley's use of Biblical phrases and figures. T. Rymer's Preface to his translation of Rapin (vol. II, 1674; see above, § 8) contains some criticism of Spenser, Davenant, Cowley, Tasso, Chapelain, Le Moyne, and others. The Preface to Edward Phillips' Theatrum Poetarum (1675) contains a definition of the epic, and a short notice of its proper subject-matter and its 'decorum.' See also Phillips' Compendious Enumeration of the Poets (1669) for praise of Paradise Lost (cf. Gayley and Scott, pp. 398, 401; Spingarn, Crit. Ess., II, 350). The Essay on Poetry (1682) of J. Sheffield, Earl of Mulgrave, Duke of Buckingham (Works. 2 vols. Lond.: 1723; wherein see vol. I, p. 146), is a labored imitation of Horace and Boileau. It is mentioned by Dryden (and Gildon, Garth, and Pope) with high praise, for policy's sake (cf. *Spectator*, No. 253), but is more truly estimated by Warton, who says that Mulgrave discoursed upon the different species of poetry "to no other purpose than to manifest his own inferiority." See also the Essay on Translated Verse by the Earl of Roscommon, i.e., W. Dillon (1684. The imitation of Milton in blank verse was added to the second ed., 1685. Cf. Spingarn, Crit. Ess., II, 356). For Sir William Temple's brief notices of the epic (1690) see vol. III of his Works (4 vols. Lond.: 1814, pp. 313–319 Of Heroic Virtue; pp. 415–417, 423 Of Poetry). T. P. Blount, De Re Poetica: or, Remarks upon Poetry, etc. (1694, pp. 58–62): a mere cento of Rapin, Mulgrave, and Temple. Vindication of Paradise Lost (ed. by Charles Gildon, 1694. See Spingarn, Crit. Ess., III, 198; and cf. pp. 321–322 for references to other early notices of Milton, previous to the papers in the *Spectator*): compare E. N. S. Thompson, Essays on Milton (Yale Univ. Press, 1914), and R. D. Havens, Seventeenth Century Notices of Milton (in *Eng. Studies*, 40: 175, 187. 1909). William Wotton, Reflections upon Ancient and Modern Learning (1694): "That though a very great deal is to be given to the genius and judgment of the poet, which are both absolutely necessary to make a good poem, what tongue soever the poet writes in; yet the language itself has so great an influence, that if Homer and Virgil had been Polanders, or High-Dutch-Men, they would never, in all probability, have thought it worth their while to attempt the writing of heroick poems" (Chap. III, pp. 34–35. See also the defense of Virgil in Chap. IV). R. Blackmore, Preface to Prince Arthur (1695): "An epic poem is a feigned or devised story of an illustrious action, related in verse, in an allegorical, probable, delightful, and admirable manner, to cultivate the mind with instructions of virtue" (cf. Le Bossu, I, 3). J. Dennis, Remarks on a Book, entituled Prince Arthur, an Heroick Poem (1696): this, "doubtless the earliest example of the complete application of Le Bossu's Aristotelianism to the study of an English epic, forestalls by many years Addison's similar treatment of Paradise Lost" (Spingarn, Crit. Ess., I, ciii). For Dryden's criticism of the epic, see above, § 8. As aids to the study of Dryden, the student should consult Gayley and Scott, §§ 20, 21; Saintsbury, Hist. Crit., 2: 371–389; W. E. Bohn, The Development of John Dryden's Literary Criticism (reprinted from the *Pubs. Mod. Lang. Ass. of America*, XXII, iii. 1907); P. Hamelius, Die Kritik in der englischen Lit. d. 17. u. 18. Jahrhs. (Leipz.: 1897); W. P. Ker, Essays of John Dryden (Oxford: 1900); Rigault (cited above, § 8), p. 310 ff.; C. A. F. Weselmann, Dryden als Kritiker (Göttingen: 1893. Diss.); L. J. Wylie, Studies in the Evolution of English Criticism (Boston: 1894. Chap. I). Charles Boyle, Dr. Bentley's Dissertations on the Epistles of Phalaris, etc. (1698): Boyle's view of the claim of Empedocles' poem to the title of epic is more in accord with Aristotle and the modern view than are the arguments of Bentley (see below). For Boyle's views, see the 4th ed. (1745), pp. 45, 195. Richard Bentley, Dissertations upon the Epistles of Phalaris (1699. First ed. published as an appendix to the second ed. of Wotton's Reflections upon Ancient and Modern Learning. See the Works of Bentley, ed. by Alexander Dyce, 3 vols., Lond.: 1836–38, vol. I, pp. 418–420): a table of the great variety of poems termed epics by the ancients, — cited in justification of calling Empedocles' Epicharmoi an epic.

C. *Eighteenth Century.*

For apparatus see above, § 3, v, c. The chief aid, bearing directly upon criticism of the epic, is in Finsler and Blankenburg; see also Irene Myers, *op. cit.*, pp. 24–27.

The beginning of the 18th century marks no logical division in the history of English criticism of the epic. The pseudo-classicism of the previous century extends to the middle of this century, if not further. Addison's is the first name of importance (see above, § 8). For the admirably critical qualities of his Pleasures of the Imagination see Gayley and Scott, p. 407. His criticisms of Paradise Lost (1711–12) and Chevy Chase belong, however, in general method, if not altogether in subject, to the formalism of the previous century. As Professor Saintsbury says, his criticism of Milton "is actually more antiquated than Dryden's, in assuming that the question whether Milton wrote according to Aristotle is coextensive with the question whether he wrote good poetry" (Hist. Crit., 2 : 443). Addison's chief contributions to epic criticism were not so much new developments as new applications of theory: they consisted in popularizing old theory and applying it to the ballad. Conventional criticism ripened in the hands of Dryden and Addison; it fell dry among their followers.

During the century epic criticism assumed two new aspects. The first, which was purely academic, had been stimulated by the Wotton-Boyle-Bentley 'ancient and modern' controversy at the end of the previous century, and was now carried on by Trapp, Spence, Warton, Warburton, and others. In their epic criticism these men relied in part upon the continental critics; but the growth of research, to which Bentley's philological and historical method had given an impetus, meant, in the long run, a gradual liberation from false views and artificial rules. English scholarship afforded a conservative but supporting background to the second and more radical of the new aspects of epic criticism, — the romantic.

The romantic opinions of Young and Warton were only preparatory to those of Hurd, Percy, and Clara Reeve. For Warton, forty years after the ridicule of 'rules' in Pope's Recipe, Le Bossu is still an accredited lawgiver, and Young does not inveigh against rules, as such, to the extent often supposed. At first romantic opinion held that within the scope of 'rules' the human spirit might dare to do as greatly as the ancients. "Our ignorance of the possible dimensions of the mind of man" supplied Young with the hope that genius by its own *tour de force* might win unforeseen triumphs.

It remained for later essays to throw off the old 'rules' of pseudo-classicism, and to begin the modern, historical — or *kulturhistorisch* — account of the epic. Two events of promise furthered this new development: first, the recognition, by Hurd (1762), of the similarities of the manners of the medieval romances and the Homeric epics; second, the discovery, by Percy (1765) and Clara Reeve (1785), of the literary similarities of these poems (compare below, § 12, Wood on Homer, 1769; also below, § 11, Blackwell, 2d ed. 1736). From such comparisons followed naturally an estimate of the epic in terms of its peculiar relations to periods and social conditions rather than to the 'rules' of literary critics. The early appearance of these views in England shows clearly how generally diffused, how European, was the historical sentiment out of which grew, in 1795, in Germany, Wolf's epoch-making Prolegomena (see below, § 11).

The following references may be suggested: Addison's criticism of the epic: see above, § 8; Gayley and Scott, § 21; A. Hansen, Addison som litteraer Kritiker (Kopenhagen: 1883); K. Kabelmann, J. Addisons lit. Kritik im Spectator (Rostock: 1900. Diss.); Saintsbury, Hist. Crit., 2: 432 ff., 437–448, *et passim*; W. J. Courthope, Addison (Lond.: 1884); E. Saudé, Die Grundlagen der literarischen Kritik bei J. Addison (Berlin: 1906). Jonathan Swift, The Battle of the Books (1710): see the descriptions of Homer and Virgil, and of Virgil's meeting with Dryden. See, also, in A Letter of Advice to a Young Poet (1721), the satirical reference to the young Dublin poet who was bent on "bestowing rhyme upon Milton's Paradise Lost." In his Characteristics (1711), Lord Shaftesbury pays more attention to comedy and tragedy than to the epic. But in a note to § III of the discourse on the Freedom of Wit and Humour, Le Bossu is praised as one who "in that admirable comment and explanation of Aristotle (Du Poème Épique), has perhaps not only shown himself the greatest of the French critics, but presented the world with a view of ancient literature and just writing beyond any other modern of whatever nation." In the Advice to an Author, the blank verse of Milton is praised and Paradise Lost is said to lack softness of language and the fashionable turn of wit; the absence of the personal note of the author in the epic is noted, and the epic is confused with the drama in the statement, based on Aristotle, that the tragic poet need only erect a stage and draw the dialogues and characters of Homer into scenes in order to make a tragedy out of the Iliad. The Christian religion is held to be no fit subject for poetic exploitation. Alexander Pope (Essay on Criticism. Written about 1709; printed 1711) pictures Virgil "with a sort of ciphering book before him, 'totting up' Homer, Nature, and the Stagirite, and finding them all exactly equivalent." Compare *Spectator*, No. 253. The celebrated Receipt to Make an Epic Poem, ridiculing Le Bossu and Mambrun, appeared in the *Guardian* (No. 78, June 10, 1713), and was afterward incorporated in The Art of Sinking in Poetry, Chap. XV, on which see Warton's note. The Preface to the Iliad (1714–1720) is a conventional seventeenth-eighteenth century discussion of Homer's supremacy in 'Invention' as shown in his copious fables (which are subdivided into probable, allegorical, and marvellous fables), his lively manners, his affecting speeches, his sublime sentiments, his animated images and descriptions, his elevated and daring expression, and his rapid and various numbers. Virgil excels in judgment. See also the General View of the Epic Poem . . . Extracted from Le Bossu, which was prefixed to the Odyssey by Broome; also the Postscript to the Odyssey. Pope's Plan of an Epic Poem may be found in the Works (ed. by William Roscoe, vol. V, 398). For Pope's fling at Milton's quibbling archangels and pedagogue of a god, see Imitations of Horace, Epistles II, i, 99; cf. Coleridge's defense, Table Talk, Sept. 4, 1833. R. Blackmore, Essays upon Several Subjects (1716). J. Trapp, Praelectiones Poeticae (1716. See 3d ed., 2 vols., 1736, vol. II, pp. 277–328). Trapp also translated Virgil, with many notes which may be consulted. Of the translation Dr. Evans' words hold true: "Read the commandments, Trapp, translate no further; For 't is written, Thou shalt do no murder." Compare Edward Young's satire, To His Grace the Duke of Dorset. Charles Gildon, in his Complete Art of Poetry (2 vols. 1718. Vol. I, pp. 267–303), depends more directly upon Aristotle than upon the French adaptations of Aristotle. Compare Gildon's Laws of Poetry (1720). See the remarks upon the epic in J. Welwood's Preface (1718) to Rowe's translation of Lucan's Pharsalia (Chalmers, Eng. Poets). Joseph Spence, Essay on Pope's Odyssey (1726); cf. Saintsbury, Hist. Crit., 2: 454, Note 1. J. Dennis' Remarks upon the Rape of the Lock (1728) contains a passage on 'machines.' Cf. Saintsbury, 2: 435 and Note, marking especially the reference to Dennis' religious conception of Paradise Lost. Richard Bentley, Dr. Bentley's Emendations on the Twelve Books of Paradise

Lost (1732. Published the same year as Bentley's ed. of P. L.): for a bibliography of the controversy growing out of Bentley's emendations, see A. T. Bartholomew and J. W. Clark, Richard Bentley, D. D., A Bibliography, etc. (Cambridge: 1908. Pp. 77–79). J. Richardson, Explanatory Notes and Remarks on Paradise Lost (1734). An Essay on the epic, in the *Gentleman's Magazine* for 1735 (pp. 356–360). On H. Pemberton's Observations on Poetry, especially the Epic; occasioned by the Poem upon Leonidas [by R. D. Glover] (1738), see the notice in Warton's Virgil (1753. Vol. IV, p. 345) and cf. Saintsbury, 3: 83, Note 1. J. Peterson, A Complete Commentary on Paradise Lost (1744). Joseph Spence, Polymetis: or, an Enquiry Concerning the Works of the Roman Poets, and the Remains of the Ancient Artists, Being an Attempt to illustrate them mutually from one another (1747. See Dialogue XX): Spence's recognition of Homer's gods as natural and moral causes approximates our present view of Homer's so-called 'machines' as a mythological system of physics and psychology. Henry Fielding discusses the use of the marvellous (Tom Jones, Chap. I, Bk. VIII, 1749), and shows his ignorance of the real nature of Homer's gods by inclining to the opinion that Homer "had an intent to burlesque the superstitious faith of his own age and country." In the Preface to his Epigoniad (1753), W. Wilkie descants upon choice of subject, machinery, style, etc. See Chalmers' English Poets, 16: 123 ff. Joseph Warton (Works of Virgil, 4 vols. 1753. Vol. II, pp. iii–xxiii Dissertation on the Nature and Conduct of the Aeneid) confessedly relies on Le Bossu. The purpose of the epic is the instruction of mankind by "displaying the beauty and excellence of virtue, its desirable fruits and happy consequences." Admiration and love, rather than pity and fear, should be excited by the epic: note the hint of an epic catharsis. The Notes to the Aeneid should also be consulted; in them will be found many quotations from Spence, Pope, Addison, Hurd, Trapp, Segrais, Catrou, Le Bossu, Dacier, and others, touching (often with much unconscious humor) upon the conduct of the epic in both its larger and smaller aspects. See especially vol. II, pp. 8, 22, 26, 30, 52, 73, 92–95, 298, 346; vol. III, 78, 82, 132, 200, 218, 342, 368; IV, 2, 48, 152, 186, 198, 244, 248, 322, 342, 422, 428. See vol. III, pp. 1–76, Warburton's Dissertation on the Sixth Book of Virgil's Aeneis (from the Divine Legation, etc., Bk. II, § 4): an attempt to show that "Aeneas's adventure to the infernal Shades, is no other than a figurative description of his initiation into the Mysteries." See, also, vol. IV, pp. 433–448, Warton's Postscript. Warton's three essays on the merits of the

Odyssey appeared in the *Adventurer*, Nos. 75, 80, 83 (1753). Considerable originality is displayed in the defense of the poem against the traditional view of its inferiority to the Iliad. On the inferiority of the modern epic, especially Milton's, see No. 127 of the *Adventurer*. D. Hume, in his Letter to the editors of the *Critical Review* concerning the Epigoniad of Wilkie (April, 1759) overrates to an astonishing degree the all-but-forgotten Scotch 'Homer' — a proof of Hume's lack of poetic insight as well as of his national partiality. Edward Young, Letter to Samuel Richardson on Original Composition (1759. In Young's Works, Dodsley, 3 vols., 1798, vol. III, pp. 173–213): the polemic against slavish imitation is, of course, general in nature; that it is directed against epic imitators as well as against others may be seen from the remark on Homer, p. 190: "If a sketch of the divine Iliad before Homer wrote, had been given to mankind by some superior being, or otherwise, its execution would probably have appeared beyond the power of man: now, to surpass it we think it impossible. As the first of these opinions would evidently have been a mistake, why may not the second be so too? Both are founded on the same bottom; on our ignorance of the possible dimensions of the mind of man." See also p. 194 for criticism of Pope's Homer. Thomas Gray's critical thought is not of importance to the theory of the epic (Works. Ed. by E. Gosse. 4 vols. Lond.: 1884. See Index, under *Erse Poems*; note the passage, Letter 119, 1756, on epic and lyric style). J. Newberry, The Art of Poetry on a New Plan (2 vols. Lond.: 1761–62): weak, intended for the young. W. Massey, Remarks upon Milton's Paradise Lost (1761). H. Home, Lord Kames, Elements of Criticism (3 vols. Edinburgh: 1762. See vol. III, Chap. XXII). Bishop Hurd, in the light of his analysis of the similarity of Gothic and Homeric civilizations, applauds the epic character of the great poems of chivalry (Ariosto, Tasso, Spenser), and, noting the differences in the two civilizations, deduces therefrom a difference in epic unity, — a Gothic unity of 'design' as distinguished from the classical unity of action. This, together with Hurd's support of Gothic marvels, was a part of the new *kulturhistorisch* view of the epic that was making its way into favor at this late day — two hundred years after similar views had been announced by the Italians, Cintio, Pigna, Castelvetro, and Patrizzi (see above, § 8, under Pigna). For Hurd's views, see Letters on Chivalry and Romance (1762. Cf. Saintsbury, Hist. Crit., 3: 75–78). Brief references to the theory of the epic will also be found in the essay On the Idea of Universal Poetry (that verse is essential to a perfect epic and that the literary type must not be modified at pleasure), and in the Discourse on Poetical Imitation (epic *vs.* history, quoting Bacon; strictures upon Gondibert). For these references, see the Works (8 vols., Lond.: 1811), vol. II; pp. 19–20, 179–181. For a reply to the criticism of Gondibert see J. Aikin, An Essay upon the Heroic Poem of Gondibert (reprinted in vol. II of Lucy Aikin's Memoir of J. Aikin, etc., 2 vols. Lond.: 1823). T. Warton acknowledges (Observations on the Fairy Queen of Spenser. Lond.: 1762) that it is absurd to judge Ariosto or Spenser by precepts to which they did not attend. "Spenser's beauties are like the flowers in Paradise," — the product of nature rather than of art. E. Gibbon, An Inquiry whether a Catalogue of the Armies sent into the Field is an essential part of an Epic Poem (Dec. 23, 1763): see Miscellaneous Works (3 vols. Dublin: 1796. Vol. III, p. 75). In his essay On the Ancient Metrical Romances (1765) Bishop Percy says: "Should the public encourage the revival of some of those ancient epic songs of chivalry, they would frequently see the rich ore of an Ariosto or a Tasso, though buried, it may be, among the rubbish and dross of barbarous times." Percy recognized the epic power of the old bards, but did not generalize his notion to include the bardic forebears of Homer. That was done by Mrs. Clara Reeve (see below), who quotes the above passage from Percy on p. 18 of vol. I of her Progress of Romance. Percy also maintained that the romance Libius Disconius has all the qualities mentioned in Fénelon's definition of the epic. "Nature and common sense had supplied to these old simple bards the want of critical art, and taught them some of the most essential rules of epic poetry." The Libius "is as regular in its conduct [of the fable] as any of the finest poems of classical antiquity. If the execution, particularly as to the diction and sentiments, were but equal to the plan, it would be a capital performance; but this is such as might be expected in rude and ignorant times, and in a barbarous, unpolished language." The essay on Minstrelsy should not be overlooked. See the Bohn ed. of the Reliques of Ancient Eng. Poetry (2 vols. 1900), vol. II, pp. 89–90, 92, 95. For Robert Wood's Essay on the Original Genius of Homer (1769), see below, § 11. J. Ogilvie, Philosophical and Critical Observations on the Nature, Character, and Various Species of Composition (2 vols. Lond.: 1774). V. Knox, Essays, Moral and Literary (1777. See 17th ed. 3 vols. Lond.: 1815, vol. II, pp. 12–15, and III, 259). For Dr. Johnson's criticism of the epic (Life of Milton, 1779–81), see above, § 8. See the Preface to Fawkes' translation of the Argonautica (1780. In Chalmers' Eng. Poets, 20: 245 ff.). Mrs. Clara Reeve (Progress of Romance, 2 vols. Colchester: 1785), in attempting to support the thesis that the romance is a prose epic, anticipates the historical method of criticism when she argues that romance and epic have grown out of the same conditions. Epic and romance "spring from the same root, — they describe the same actions and circumstances, — they produce the same effects, and they are continually mistaken for each other" (vol. I, p. 16). In vol. IV of his Historical View of the English Government (4th ed. 4 vols. Lond.: 1818, pp. 319–335. 1st ed. 1787) John Millar discusses the difference between epic and drama as regards imagery and the subjective attitude of the poet. After considering what age is best suited to epic poetry, he concludes that the epic is an obsolete form and that the novel has displaced it. A straightforward but not thoroughly convincing line of argument. Belsham's Essays (1791) have been commented upon above, § 8. John Hawkesworth's Preface to his translation of the Télémaque (2 vols. Edinburgh: 1792. 1st ed. 1768) is drawn mostly, and without acknowledgment, from the Chevalier Ramsay's Discours prefixed to the French edition of the Télémaque and does not agree with the view (Voltaire) that the French have no "*tête épique*." See also the *Adventurer*, No. 4 (1752), for Hawkesworth's brief suggestions as to the relations of history, epic, and romance. H. J. Pye's A Commentary Illustrating the Poetic of Aristotle, etc. (Lond.: 1792), contains many references to earlier critics. Hugh Blair treats Ossian as Addison treated Paradise Lost (Dissertation on Ossian. In the Poems of Ossian. 2 vols. Lond.: 1796). See also the Lectures on Rhetoric and Belles Lettres (1783).

Notice should be taken of the numerous periodicals of this age. Some of these have been mentioned above, § 3, V, C.

D. *Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries.*

For apparatus see above, § 3, V, D.

The general characteristics of the English criticism of this period are noted above (§ 3, V, D). Here it will be sufficient to suggest the broadest divisions of criticism as applied to epic poetry.

First it must be remembered that from the time of Wolf's Prolegomena (1795; see below, § 11) the pseudo-classical conception of the epic declined. The reason for this is obvious. The result of the work of Wolf and his followers, whatever of exaggeration and vagary may have attended the task, had been to establish two conceptions: (1) that of a national epopee which is the final product of a long process of communal and anonymous individual composition, and presents the traditions and ideals of a whole people rather than the individual thought and feelings of a particular author; (2) the conception of the imitative epopee, often national in its traditional materials, but peculiarly the product of the feelings and ideals of a single, known poet, who works after the pattern of the former, or original, epopee. But the pseudo-classical recipes for epic composition were based upon a tacit assumption that the original epopee, such as the Iliad, was written in the same way as the Aeneid or the Henriade or Jerusalem Delivered, and that therefore any poet of promise could in any age produce an Iliad provided he observed the formal proprieties. The newer criticism differentiated two methods of composition; the older knew only one, based its criteria thereon, and necessarily declined when the error in its assumption became evident.

Moreover it is natural that the new way of regarding such poems as the Iliad, the Roland, the Beowulf, the Nibelungenlied, and the Cid, should direct more attention to the cultural conditions of their growth than to their formal poetic qualities. More and more, criticism of the epic has come to consist in the investigation of the conditions of communal authorship and of minstrelsy, of stages of culture peculiar to group authorship, of conditions under which group authorship yielded to individual redaction or creation. It has devoted itself also to textual analysis with a view to showing combinations of sources and determining strata of composition; and to other allied questions. Not that those who are interested in these problems are blind to poetic qualities or have neglected to speculate upon the philosophical meaning of the epic; but the new study is primarily historical in character, and its speculation is based upon the significant relations of the epic to certain cultural conditions rather than to a universal aesthetic taste. All such studies have therefore been classed in this work under an historical heading (see below,

§§ 10–12), and the student should by no means neglect to explore such works for all that they contain of historical-economic-philosophical speculation on the nature and function of the epic, including incidental references to aesthetic criteria.

What then is the general character of the modern English works upon the epic which remain to be noted at this place? Are they mere left-overs from the pseudo-classical method? or do they develop those principles of the classical doctrine which remain universally true (such as the necessity of plot, character, action in a narrative poem; the necessity of consistency, probability, significance, etc.)? or do they discover new aesthetic criteria? All this and much else the student will find in these essays. Comparative treatment of technique and other aesthetic details, attempts to see the author in his work or the general spirit of an age in the poem, interpretation and appreciation, psychology and philosophy, — all these may be, often are, united in various proportions to constitute a modern essay upon the epic. From Coleridge to Arnold, from Macaulay to Professor Raleigh the contents of an essay upon the epic vary within a certain range of topics that are adequately enough suggested by the titles in. § 8, above. Freed from the kind-categories of seventeenth- and eighteenth-century criticism the modern poetic censor has disported in fields that are richer and wider, though they are less peculiarly literary, than were the more technical reaches of the dictators from Horace to Dryden. Therein, by the way, lies perchance one reason for the absence of the literary dictator in the present age. But perhaps it is true that taken as a whole the tendency of most recent criticism that is not purely historical is to expound and appreciate the degree of poetic expressiveness to be found in poems, great and small. True, epic expressiveness, as distinct from lyric or dramatic expressiveness, may at times engage the attention of the critic; but we may discern a tendency to regard general poetic expressiveness rather than the characteristics of a type (see Spingarn, The New Criticism (N.Y.: 1911) and cf. Croce's Aesthetics).

In the criticism of the sort suggested here the student must conduct his explorations with but few guides and directions. His task first of all will be to determine by such analysis as is possible the variety of topics discussed and the degree of unanimity attained in the discussion of each topic. The search for materials will extend through many essays that do not deal primarily with the epic as well as through those devoted to the subject. Here we can note only a few typical contributions. Above, in § 8, many important critiques have already been annotated. Others are as follows:

W. P. Knight, Principles of Taste (2d ed. 1805). J. Black, Life of Tasso (2 vols. 1810). W. Hazlitt, Lectures on the English Poets (1818). See especially the descriptions (in the lecture On Poetry in General) of Homer, Dante, and Ossian: "In Homer, the principle of action or life is predominant; in the Bible, the principle of faith and the idea of Providence; Dante is the personification of blind will; and in Ossian we see the decay of life and the lag end of the world." See also the essays on Spenser and Milton. Hazlitt's description of Satan is noteworthy. Thomas Campbell's Essay on English Poetry (prefixed to Specimens of the British Poets, 1819) contributes nothing to the theory of the poetic kinds, but we may note the contention that Hurd's defense of the "gothic" unity of the Faerie Queene does not persuade us that the poem is not too intricate and diffuse. Of Milton's union of pagan myth and Christian story Campbell writes: "He yoked the heathen mythology in triumph to his subject, and clothed himself in the spoils of superstition." Henry Neele, in the second of his lectures on English Poetry (pp. 44–78, Lond.: 1830), gives a spicy characterization of epic and narrative poetry. De Quincey's Brief Appraisal of the Greek Literature (1838–39; in *Tait's Edinb. Mag.*) contains the assertions that in sublimity Milton far transcends Homer, and that Chaucer is superior in narrative art, characterization, and the picturesque. On Milton as the greatest and almost sole example of sublimity, compare the essay On Milton (1839; in *Blackwood*): in the same essay see a defense of Milton's combination of the Christian and pagan pantheons. See also Milton *versus* Southey and Landor (1847; in *Tait's Mag.*). Note De Quincey's preference for Christian sublimities over those of the classical epics (Letters to a Young Man, IV, 1823). J. A. Froude, Homer (in *Fraser's Mag.*, 1851; and Short Studies on Great Subjects, 1st Series). T. Keightley, An Account of the Life, Opinions, and Writings of John Milton (1855). W. Bagehot, Literary Studies (2 vols. Lond.: 1879): Milton (1859), I, 206 ff.; cf. II, 356: the "vicious principle" in Paradise Lost. J. R. Seeley, Milton's Poetry (in Roman Imperialism and Other Lectures and Essays. Boston: 1871). E. H. Bickersteth, Milton's Paradise Lost (in St. James Lectures, 2d Series. 1876). Mark Pattison, Milton (E. M. L., 1879). Matthew Arnold, A French Critic on Milton (in Mixed Essays, 1880); for Arnold on Homer, see above, § 8. For a discussion of the literary epic the student is referred to the comparison between Milton and Virgil by G. A. Simcox, vol. II, pp. 272–275, of his History of Latin Literature from Ennius to Boethius (2 vols., Lond.: 1883). J. A. Himes, The Plan of Paradise Lost (*New Englander*, 42: 196–211. 1883); Study of Milton's P. L. (1878). Augustine Birrell, Milton, in Obiter Dicta, 2d Series (Lond.: 1887). Aubrey de Vere, Spenser, in Essays, Chiefly on Poetry (2 vols. Lond.: 1887). E. Dowden, Transcripts and Studies (on Milton and Spenser; 1888). R. Garnett, Life of John Milton (Great Writers Series, 1890). Brother Azarias, Spiritual Sense of the Divina Commedia, in Phases of Thought and Criticism (Boston: 1893). R. Burton, Nature in Old English Poetry (in *Atlantic Mo.*, April, 1894). F. T. Palgrave, Landscape in Poetry from Homer to Tennyson (Lond.: 1897). J. M. McBryde, Jr., A Study of Cowley's Davideis (in *Jour. Germ. Philol.*, 2: 454–527. 1898). Tyrrell, Latin Poetry: Virgil (1898). J. W. Mackail, Latin Literature: Virgil (3d ed. 1899); see the same author's Lectures on Greek Poetry (1910) and Lectures on Poetry: Virgil, Dante (1911). Sir Walter Raleigh, in his work on Milton (Lond.: 1900), has a clever and somewhat paradoxical discussion of the poet and his work. The literary influence upon Milton, not of Spenser, but of the Elizabethan dramatists, and the materialistic nature of Milton's genius, are topics of interest. Chap. III discusses the 'scheme' of P. L., and has much to say indirectly upon its psychological origin; in Chap. IV the characters and epic descriptions are treated in essay-fashion; Chaps. V and VI are devoted to Milton's style and its influence upon the style of English poetry. Great promise and little performance characterize what Dr. H. C. Muller has to say upon the epic in his Lectures on the Science of Literature, etc., 1st Series, pp. 67–80 (Haarlem: 1904). W. H. Sheran, A Handbook of Literary Criticism (N.Y.: 1905), pp. 466–513. S. L. Whitcomb, The Study of a Novel, p. 180: the relation of novel to epic (Boston: 1905). Oliver Elton, Spenser, in Modern Studies (Lond.: 1907). In the *Quarterly Rev.* of April, 1908, vol. 208, pp. 553–567, is an article by W. W. Comfort on the Heroic Ideal of the French Epic. E. G. Sihler, Testimonium Animae, etc. (N.Y.: 1908): spiritual elements in classical civilization. H. T. Peck, Studies in Several Literatures (N.Y.: 1909), the Odyssey. The author asserts that there is only one epic (the Odyssey) that has possessed a fascination for all peoples of all ages since its completion, and that all other epics "survive because they appeal either to the pride of some particular race or nation, or because they are made the subject of special study by highly educated persons." A. Austin, The Bridling of Pegasus (Lond.: 1910). G. Murray, What English Poetry may still learn from the Greek (in *Atlantic Mo.*, Nov., 1912), — an admirable essay. E. N. S. Thompson, The Theme of Paradise Lost (*Pubs. Mod. Lang. Ass.*, 28: 106–120; 1913). H. E. Cory, Edmund Spenser, a Critical Study (*Univ. of Calif. Pubs. Mod. Philol.*, vol. V. Berkeley: 1917), a sympathetic and penetrative study, with a review of the critical attitude, 1597 to the present, toward Spenser; should be consulted for valuable suggestions concerning pastoral and elegiac poetry as well as the romantic epic.

VIII. **German.**

Apparatus for the general history of German criticism is cited above, § 3, VI. The most helpful guide in tracing the development of German theory of the Homeric poems, and so, in part, of general epic theory, is G. Finsler's Homer in der Neuzeit (Berlin: 1912), pp. 377–474 of which carry the history from Erasmus to the Schlegels. A very brief *résumé* is contained in Irene Myers' Study in Epic Development (Yale Studies in English, XI, 1901), pp. 27–32.

A. *To the Eighteenth Century.*

For apparatus see above, § 3, VI, A. The chief aids to the study of epic criticism are Borinski, Finsler, and Blankenburg (Art. Heldengedicht). For French influence upon German writings on epic and romance see Borinski, p. 347 ff. See also J. E. Gillet, Drama und Epos in der deutschen Renaissance (in *Jr. of Eng. and Germ. Phil.*, 15: 35. 1916).

German criticism before the 18th century — indeed, until the second half of that century — is negligible. What there is relies naïvely upon Horace and Italian and French poetics. Finsler has collected references to show a Dutch, German, and Swiss knowledge of Homer in the 16th century (see his notes, pp. 377–387, on Erasmus, Jacobus Latomus, Johannes Reuchlin, Hutten, Melanchthon, Luther, Joachim Camerarius, Zwingli, Rudolf Collinus, Bullinger, Eobanus Hessus, Simon Lemnius, Schaidenreisser, and Hans Sachs; for titles see Finsler, p. 489), and a long list, of course, could be made up of those acquainted with Virgil. But this knowledge of the churchmen, reformers, philosophers, and schoolmasters involved little criticism: Homer was praised, in the Horatian way, for imparting both pleasure and instruction, and in the earnest way of Luther's time the emphasis was laid upon the moral teaching hidden in his fables; Hessus supported Homer against Vida's preference for Virgil, and occasionally others refer to the Homer-Virgil comparison. The fathers of Germanic poetics offer but little more. Fabricius (De Re Poetica, 1565, 1584, 1595) relies upon Minturno, Scaliger, *et al.* Some material may be found in the third book of the Poetical Institutions of the Dutch savant Voss (De Artis Poeticae Natura ac Constitutione, Amsterdam: 1647; see Saintsbury, Hist. Crit., 3: 359), "all old stuff rehandled." One of the first poetics in the German tongue is the Buch von der deutschen Poeterey of Martin Opitz (Breslau: 1624; in Neudrucke deutscher Litteraturwerke des 16. u. 17. Jahrhs., 1). Naïve and superficial, a mere copy of ancient and Renaissance critics, relying in particular upon Scaliger (though not sharing Scaliger's Homeric antipathies), Ronsard, and Heinsius, this rather famous little work has only an historical importance. On pp. 19–22 of the edition cited will be found a brief account of some parts of the epic and of the relations of epic and history. Homer is mentioned, but not as by one who had read him. Awe, or wonder, is noted as a principal ingredient of heroic verse; the story is arranged "in such order as if one thing followed the other and came unsought into the book"; the epic poem is long, treats of great men and deeds, and begins immediately with the main subject and the design of the poet. Caspar Barth, in his Adversariorum Commentariorum Libri 60 (Frankfurt: 1624), takes Scaliger to task for the latter's attacks upon Homer (22: 1479, 47: 2230).

Borinski (pp. 120–121) mentions the translation of the Jerusalem Delivered by Dietrich von dem Werder, and Augustine Buchner's criticism of the performance. For Sigmund von Birken (1679), see above, § 6, XIII, D, and cf. Borinski, p. 232. D. G. Morhof, Unterricht von der deutschen Sprache und Poesie (Kiel: 1682), Chap. 14. Blankenburg also mentions, without date, A. C. Rothen's Vollst. deutscher Poesie, Pt. 3, Chap. 6. For further notices (Weckherlin, Schottel, Zesen, Weise, Wernicke, Werenfels, and others) see Borinski, as noted at the head of this period. The student should remember that the Thirty Years' War, beginning in 1618, accounts in large part for the dearth of learned treatises during the heart of the German 17th century. From the close of that war French influence predominated in German literary taste, a testimony of which, so far as the epic is concerned, is the composition, toward the close of the century, of an epic (Der grosse Wittekind, by C. H. Postel; published posthumously, Hamburg: 1792) on the model of Scudéry's Alaric (see Finsler, 389–390).

B. *The Eighteenth Century.*

For apparatus see above, § 3, VI, B. The chief aids are Braitmaier, Finsler, Neboliczka, and Blankenburg. For theories developed at the close of this and the opening of the next century see K. Fortmüller, Die Theorie des Epos bei den Brüdern Schlegel, den Klassikern und W. von Humboldt (Progr., Wien: 1903); also Harnack and Lotze, as noted above, § 8.

During this century German criticism of the epic advances from the negligible quality and quantity of the previous century to a foremost position in the European study of the epic. The history of this advance may be conveniently summarized under six heads.

1. *Pseudo-classicism of Gottsched and his School.* In our review of German 18th-century criticism of the lyric we have already characterized the pseudo-classical ideals, under French influence, of J. C. Gottsched. The account of the epic given in this author's arch-legislative Versuch einer kritischen Dichtkunst (1730, with

later enlarged editions) is a web of rules from within outward. In an original way Gottsched follows Le Bossu and Aristotle. His opposition to the marvellous, the enthusiastic, and the romantic in general brought him into the famous quarrel with the Swiss School. In the polemics that followed, Gottsched went to extremes of classicism, grudgingly acknowledging Homer, scorning Milton, ridiculing Ariosto and Tasso for their disordered marvels. Further samples of Gottschedian criticism may be examined in the numbers of the *Beiträge zur kritischen Historie der deutschen Sprache, Poesie, und Beredsamkeit* (under Gottsched's direction, 1732–44). Finsler, p. 394, cites a typical example of Gottsched's use of the critical yardstick,—his criticism of Wolf Helmhart von Hochberg's heroic poem, Der habsburgische Ottobert (1664; the critique is Stück 8 of the *Beiträge*, 1734). On Gottsched see Braitmaier, *op. cit.*; E. Reichel, Gottsched (2 vols. Berlin: 1909–12); also the references given above, § 6, and by Gayley and Scott, § 20. For later examples of French influence see J. A. Schlegel's translation of Batteux (for whom see § 8) with the addition of commentaries in which the poetic kinds are duly considered and the place of the marvellous duly discussed (1751 and later); J. F. von Bielfeld (noted above, § 3, VI, B).

2. *The Swiss School and the Miltonic Controversy*. In 1724 J. J. Bodmer, a Swiss, translated Paradise Lost; and about 1740 the Swiss defense of Milton's blank verse, romantic suggestiveness, and use of the supernatural began. In the Kritische Abhandlung von dem Wunderbaren in der Poesie . . . in einer Vertheidigung des Gedichtes J. Miltons, etc. (Zürich: 1740), Bodmer took up the cudgels against Voltaire and other neo-classical critics of Milton. For his views reduced to practice the student may turn to his Noachide, an attempt at an epic. In 1740 J. Breitinger, Bodmer's brother in arms, also discoursed upon the marvellous in a Kritische Dichtkunst (Zürich), which in spite of some naïve observations on epic and Aesopic fable contributed ideas of worth; but even they were partly borrowed. In a comparison of Homer and Virgil he recognized the Greek as the greater natural genius, the

Roman as the greater artist (for which idea see Pope and Addison). Gottsched, in later editions of his Versuch einer kritischen Dichtkunst, controverted the Swiss heresies, and there ensued a very wordy war conducted largely by means of periodicals of extraordinary titles, for the full account and bibliography of which one may consult Braitmaier. Among the contemporary defenders of Milton was C. F. Nicolai; but his Briefe über den jetzigen Zustand der schönen Wissenschaften in Deutschland (1755) displayed antagonism to both the Gottschedian and Swiss schools. In the end the heretics had the better of the argument; and, what was essentially valuable, they prepared the way for the appreciation of Milton in Germany. The elucidation also of the Homeric epics and their liberation from pedantic, neo-classical criticism were furthered by these Swiss critics. Bodmer's Kritische Betrachtungen über die poetischen Gemälde der Dichter (Zürich: 1741; see index under Episches, Homerus, Tasso, Virgil, etc.) and Breitinger's previous Kritische Abhandlung von der Natur, den Absichten und dem Gebrauche der Gleichnisse (1740) contributed to this result both by defending Homer against French attacks and by developing the appreciation of Homeric description. (For Bodmer's minor Homeric essays see Finsler, 407–408.) It should be remembered, however, that for practically all of their work, these friends borrowed freely from the French and English. Breitinger's work on Homeric comparison, for instance, derives in great part, either directly or indirectly, from Mme. Dacier, Lamotte, Boileau, Saint-Évremond, Pope, Addison, Spence, and others. Indeed the two Swiss critics had twenty years before been much on a level with French pseudo-classical criticism, and had once been in substantial critical agreement with Gottsched himself; but opposition to French influence in German poetry had been the 'fruit-bringing' factor of this *Gesellschaft*. The student may read with interest Bodmer's critical weekly, *Diskurse der Maler*, 1721; and note the extent to which Bodmer and Breitinger relied upon the epigram of Simonides, that painting is mute poetry, poetry a speaking picture.

3. *Influence of the New School of Aesthetics.* "But while on either side the adherents of Bodmer and Gottsched were exalting for imitation antagonistic models of poetic perfection, it appeared to another critic that both parties misunderstood the nature of the subject. This was Baumgarten, who, by his De Nonnullis ad Poema pertinentibus (1735) and his Aesthetics (2 Bde., 1750–58), exhibited the relation of poetics to aesthetics and established the position of the latter as an independent science" (Gayley and Scott, 423–424). The influence of Baumgarten is well explained in J. G. Sulzer's Allgemeine Theorie der schönen Künste, etc., 1771, noted above, § 8, with reference to its valuable bibliographies. Sulzer's articles on Held and Heldengedicht marked an advance toward a new cultural, comparative, aesthetic view of the epic, as will be seen in his treatment of the following topics: origin of epic material (in heroic songs sung at festivals of the lower races), character of the epic hero, unity and simplicity of action, moral significance and function of the epic, variety of epic subjects. Further theory of the epic, matured under the new influence, may be traced in the works of Mendelssohn and Engel, as noted above, § 2; J. A. Eberhard, Theorie der schönen Künste und Wissenschaften (1783), Handbuch der Aesthetik (4 vols. 1803–05); Gellert, Wie weit sich der Nutzen der Regeln in d. Beredsamkeit und Poesie erstrecke (Sämmt. Schr., Berlin: 1774–75, 7: 117–154). In every field of literary criticism the importance of aesthetics as a science is recognized: one may readily apprehend the effect in the works of Lessing, Nicolai, Herder, Goethe, Schiller, Richter, and the rest of the great German writers of the second half of the 18th and of the 19th century. Specific mention as of typical purport may be made of Nicolai's Bibliothek der schönen Wissenschaften (1757–60), in which Mendelssohn had a hand, and his Briefe die neueste Literatur betreffend (1759–66), in which both Mendelssohn and Lessing aided; and of Lessing's famous Laokoon (1766). By way of illustrating the limits of poetry and painting, and toning down the Swiss critics, Lessing expounds,

not always correctly, but in the broad manner of the new school, Homer's indirect method of presenting description through action or through effect upon the beholder. With regard to Lessing's argument, Finsler's suggestion (*op. cit.*, 424) is worthy of notice: that Homer's purpose in such 'indirect descriptions' was not descriptive at all, since in every such case the object was so well known to the audience as not to need describing; that, on the other hand, Homer did describe, directly and at length, what was not known to his audience.

4. *Herder and the Rise of the Historical School.* The comparative view of aesthetics suggested an historical method, but to Herder must be given the credit for so conceiving and expressing the high significance and romantic possibilities of this method as to catch the imagination of men and develop what may well be called the new, or historical, humanism. Baumgarten and aesthetics, Herder and the genetic method: from such seed German criticism sprang; and Lessing, Goethe, Schiller, Richter, and the Schlegels nurtured the plant and gave it European preëminence. Of Herder we shall speak in § 11; also see above, §§ 2, 8. Suffice it here to remind the student that to his revolt against the unhistorical dicta and methods of neo-classicism, and to his vision of the evolution of culture, modern literary study owes one of its prime impulses. Herder's publications began in 1767. Gerstenberg, the year before, had protested in his Briefe über die Merkwürdigkeiten der Literatur with true romantic vigor against the neo-classical formalism, especially against Thomas Warton's method of criticizing Spenser. Not to rules and formulas, said Gerstenberg, but to the natural genius of the poet should the critic's attention be directed. Virgil and Ben Jonson and Corneille were great, but they lacked poetic genius; Homer and Shakespeare were possessed of it (see Briefe 1, 2, 3, 19, 20, etc.). Even seven years earlier, J. G. Hamann also, whose influence upon Herder was great, had espoused the principle of literary evolution, had applied it to the Homeric epic and the earlier periods of national literature, and had protested, *pari passu*, against neo-classic

misconceptions of epic composition. (Finsler, who gives an excellent account of Hamann, pp. 428–429, offers the following references: Hamann's Schriften, ed. F. Roth, Berlin: 1824–43. 1: 514; 2: 220, 257, 440; 3: 6, 22, 431. But the student should inquire further; he should also compare Hamann's point of view with that of Blackwell, 1736, as noted in § 11.) Later protests may be found in Goethe's Schreiben über den Homer von Seybold (Kleine Schriften, 1772) and J. B. Merian's Comment les sciences influent dans la poésie (*Mém. de l'Acad. Royale*, 1773–74. Berlin: 1776, p. 455). Whatever the distant origins of the new order, the vision was Herder's and the battle-cry.

This new criticism was much concerned with the epic. The Homeric epic became the chief support of the evolutionary theory. The probable development of the Iliad from 'primitive' poetic forms, — ballads and lays, — its characteristic connection with certain stages of social evolution, and its value as an historical palimpsest — of these Herder has much to say; and of epic in general: of its relation to folk-poetry and national consciousness, of correspondences in stages of belief and stages of epic development, of the living traditions involved in the epos, of how written history supersedes the epos, and of other allied topics. Nor does he avoid significant questions of technical theory, such as the use of myth in Christian epics, the comparative excellence of epic and tragedy, or the function of description in the epic (for a more complete statement see references to Herder in §§ 8, 11). Especial attention may be directed to Herder's Ossianic studies and to the influence of English criticism and literature upon his theory of the epic (see § 11).

5. *The Classicism of Goethe, Schiller, and von Humboldt.* Most of the criticism of Goethe and Schiller with which we have to do belongs not to their *Sturm und Drang* but to their classical period. They and von Humboldt, though fructified by the aesthetic and historical methods, cling nevertheless to the conviction that a critic should sit in judgment and that he should judge according to principles. Accordingly their reflections, letters,

reviews, and popular aesthetics develop theories of literary kinds and merits, always with a wider and more sympathetic induction than was known to the neo-classicists, but still in the spirit of the theory of kind, function, and technique. Goethe's scattered references to the epic may be gathered from his letters (Goethe and Schiller), book-reviews, and articles on German and foreign literature: see especially Über epische und dramatische Dichtung (1797), noted above, § 8; Shakespeare und kein Ende (1813–16); notice of Manzoni's Adelchi (1827), of Johanna Schopenhauer's Gabriele (1823); Über den sogenannten Dilettantismus (1799), Maximen und Reflexionen (1821–26), Wilhelm Meister, Dichtung und Wahrheit, etc. The chief contribution to epic theory is contained in the division of poetry into lyric and pragmatic, which Goethe worked out in company with Schiller. Epigrammatic utterances on the nature of the epic and its differentiation from novel and drama constitute the remainder of his theory so far as it here concerns us. A convenient summary is provided in O. Walzel's introduction to vol. 36 of the Jubiläums Ausgabe of Goethe's Werke. Carriere quotes often from Goethe in his Die Poesie, ihr Wesen und Formen (see pp. 205, 225, of the 2d edition, 1884). Schiller in his answer (1797) to Goethe's remarks on epic and dramatic poetry (see Letter 400 of the Correspondence, noted above, § 8) refines and subtilizes on the treatment of time and reality, reaching the conclusion that tragedy at its highest strives for an epic characteristic, and epic at its highest for a dramatic. The Essay on Simple and Sentimental Poetry (in *Die Horen*, 1795–96) is noted above, § 8: the differentiation of the two sorts of poetry is conducted largely with reference to Homer, and the suggestive contrast with Ariosto involves wide historical and aesthetic generalizations. See also the letters of Schiller and von Humboldt. Of the admirable essay by von Humboldt on Hermann und Dorothea we have spoken above, § 8. It should be noted that von Humboldt's real quarrel with neo-classical standards lies not so much in the method of their conception as in the narrowness of their induction. He does for Hermann und Dorothea much what Aristotle did for Homer, but he adds something of historical and aesthetic method.

6. *Wolf and the Homeric Question.* C. G. Heyne, one of F. A. Wolf's teachers, long before he published his speculations as a series of annotations and commentaries in his Homeri Carmina (Leipz.: 1802), had meditated and taught revolutionary ideas concerning the composition of the Homeric poems. The suggestions of D'Aubignac (1664; pub. 1715), Blackwell (1735), Hamann (1759), Herder (1767), and Wood (1769) were developed by Heyne. He believed that the mythic manner of narration was the natural expression of a certain stage of culture, that this sort of narration was in common use before Homer, and that Homer in composing his epics employed many lays from this earlier body of narrative, putting them together, however, not in the loose fashion supposed by D'Aubignac, but under the dominance of a unifying idea. Other aspects of the general question of how these epics were composed were also discussed by Heyne. In 1795 Wolf, indebted more than he acknowledged to Heyne, and to Vico as well (1722; see § 11), and to the men mentioned above and to others, published a concatenated lawyer's argument to show that the so-called 'Homeric poems' were put together from previous poems (not all by the same poet) that had been handed down by oral tradition (for longer notice see below, § 11). The hypothesis came at a time when the decay of neo-classicism, the development of the return-to-nature movement, and the rise of the historical school of Herder assured it general notice if not immediate acceptance. Many did accept it at once; many gazed with profound regret at a disappearing belief in the old, blind creator of epics. Plentiful discussion and argument at once arose; gradually the new theory of epic composition developed and was applied to the Nibelungenlied and other original, national epics. But this criticism, whereby German savants became dominant in the field of a 'higher' epic criticism, carries us over into the historical field. The development of historical criticism and of Germany's share in it may be traced below, in §§ 10, 11, 12.

Thus by the close of the 18th century German criticism had achieved a foremost position. Lessing, Goethe, Schiller, von Humboldt; Baumgarten, Sulzer, and the other aestheticians; Herder and his school; Wolf and the ever increasing number of his followers, — all these had contributed to the florescence of German critical study. The Wolfian hypothesis was concerned altogether with the epic, the historical school largely with it; the aestheticians also gave it detailed consideration, and the great classicists by no means neglected to speculate upon its function and technique. New dignity had been given to speculation upon technique; wider, more philosophical attempts at definition had been made; historical criticism was born.

C. *The Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries.*

For apparatus see above, § 3, VI, C; also, J. Körner, Nibelungenforschungen der deutschen Romantik (Wackenroder to Lachmann), in *Untersuch. z. neuren Sprach. und Litgesch.*, N. F., No. 9, 1911.

In the critical theory of this period several tendencies are apparent; and usually individual writers were influenced by more than one. Thinkers have played the part of bees, carrying pollen from one flower to another, — fructifying deductive aesthetics, for instance, which had long ago done its unassisted utmost, with spores of an inductive method borrowed from the nascent historico-scientific school. During the 19th century the historico-scientific tendency received a new impetus from the evolutionary theory of the biologists; and, thus reinforced, it has influenced practically all the critical movements of the age. On the one hand, such poems as the Nibelungenlied, the Roland, and the Beowulf are studied in order to support the *Lieder-Theorie.* On the other hand, investigations, general and special, are made that have for their aim the discovery and orderly arrangement of literary events, the establishment of interrelations, and the determination of historical, social, and literary influences. Many of this latter sort do indeed contain passages of appreciation or appraisal illuminating to the student of critical art and theory (see, e.g., K. O. Müller, Ulrici, in § 8, above). But *Lieder-Theorie* separators and historical investigators will receive attention elsewhere (§§ 10, 11, 12).

The contribution of deductive aesthetics, in continuation from the 18th century, is, as we have said, more or less affected by the method of the historical school; but not at first vitally. Passing the Vorschule der Aesthetik (1804) of Richter — who in general poetic spirit has much in common with the old *Sturm und Drang* but whose Aesthetik is, for him, strikingly sane and conservative — and the romantic poetics of K. W. F. Solger's Vorlesung über Aesthetik (1829), we come to the greatest name in German poetics, Hegel. The nature, kinds, and conditions of poetry Hegel brought into symmetrical congruence with his fundamental philosophic conceptions; and, by way of attractive though not convincing proof, he added some striking generalizations on the historical development of the art. His utterances upon the epic have already been noted (§ 7, 1, c, and § 8). He devotes himself largely to ringing the changes upon the objectivity of the type, — as seen in the author's general attitude toward life and in his handling of plot, situation, and characters; to ringing the changes upon its historicity and social function, its religious derivation and motivation, its treatment of will and destiny, individual freedom and necessity, its significance as expressive of a certain sort or stage of spiritual development, its characteristic effect upon the passions and soul. Indeed, guided by Hegel and other German theoretic aestheticians upon the epic, the reader is almost persuaded that he himself apprehends the pre-ordained character of the epics and sees, though somewhat darkly, the place and service of those great social poems in the divine scheme of eternity and space, matter and spirit. Into some connection or other with finite and infinite, relative and absolute, real and ideal, individual and universal, practical and transcendental, the Hegelian speculators upon first principles and ultimate ends always bring the traits of epic literature — always impressive though not always familiar. The alluring cosmic generalizations of Hegel and his disciples (Carriere and Vischer, in particular), or of F. W. J. von Schelling, Schopenhauer, or E. von Hartmann, may be followed through the references in § 8, above. The student who attends the philosopher in his deductive passage from some conception of ultimate reality to the beautiful, thence to the arts in general, thence to poetry, and, finally, to the epic, will ponder the essence and function of the epic more carefully than did the critics from Aristotle to Boileau and Voltaire. The process may be somewhat confusing and painful; but without doubt it is profitable. German aesthetics from Hegel to von Hartmann has made a vital contribution to epic theory. The student should not forget to note the extent to which these bold speculations were stimulated by the historical conceptions of Herder and his followers.

Of inductive aesthetics and poetics, of Scherer, Bruchmann, Wackernagel, and Wolff, and their attempts to correct theory by a scientific analysis and classification of literary phenomena, influenced as they were by modern anthropological methods, we have spoken already (§ 3, VI, C), and the last three are mentioned in § 8. Here we need only note that in proportion to the thoroughness of the induction is the modesty of the generalization, a fact which is not particularly encouraging to the student who has surrendered himself to the empyreanism of speculative aesthetics. Compensation, however, lies in the light which the anthropologist is able to shed upon ideas and customs of the epic age. The anthropological elucidation of the Homeric poems is also far more trustworthy and informing than were the ingenious elucidations of the neo-classical apologists. Higher than the apologists, though not so high as the transcendentalists, — such is the middle flight of the anthropologist. When, as is the case with Wackernagel, induction and deduction supplement each other in ingenious fashion, a work of infinite suggestion and great practical use results.

Germans and their followers have been most methodical in the analysis of literary qualities, kinds and sub-kinds. No Werner (see § 2), to be sure, has invented an epic permutation, but indefatigable, if not always illuminating, observation has characterized the work of such men as Fischer, Steinthal, Plüss, Heinze, and Olrik (all noted more in detail in § 8). Typical of this industry is F. X. Kraus' Dante, sein Leben und sein Werk, sein Verhältniss zur Kunst und zur Politik (Berlin: 1897). The third part, or book, discusses at length the content and purpose of the Divine Comedy, gives the history of its interpretation, discusses the relation of the poet to his work (Chap. IV), and the nature and form of the poem (Chaps. V and VI). Kraus maintains that Dante's character was such that the mere joy of artistic creation could not have been with him the only aim of poetic activity, as it was with Tasso and Ariosto: beyond this there was a deeper purpose, "die Vergöttlichung des Menschen." The work as a whole is very valuable to the student of Dante, but it is curiously lacking in original literary criticism, especially of the comparative sort. On the other hand, such work as Panzer's observations upon old German folk-epic (see §§ 8, 11) is enriched with valuable suggestions and conclusions.

In not a few attempts to summarize the history of epic studies like industry appears. For aid of this kind we have frequently been grateful during the compilation of these notes to Georg Finsler, whose extensive work on modern Homeric scholarship satisfies a curiosity many a student of history has experienced. It supplies one basis for generalization concerning the laws governing the development of criticism, — if there be such laws. Other summaries of epic theories have been made by Adam, Braitmaier, Harnack, Hartung, Hillebrand, E. Müller, and others (for whom see § 8). Nor, while we are speaking of the industry of German scholarship, should we ignore the gleams of critical theory discernible in the encyclopedias and *Grundrisse* of the philologists, — for instance, those of Bernhardy, Boeckh, Paul, Gröber, Wülker, Körting, Goedeke, Ivan Müller, and Hinneberg (see below, §§ 10, 11, 12).

Last of all, though by no means exhausting the tendencies of German epic criticism since 1800, may be mentioned the myriad short essays — speculative, interpretative, appreciative, critical-biographical, critical-historical — which have appeared in book, pamphlet, and periodical form. To summarize these, including every program, inaugural dissertation, doctor's thesis, and magazine article, is beyond our power. In the learned periodicals and the bibliographical guides mentioned in the Appendix the student will find preliminary charts for voyage upon that sea.

The following is a brief list, indeed somewhat haphazard, of further references. Before exploring them, however, the student should study the more important works which have been listed in § 8. J. P. Richter, Vorschule der Aesthetik (1804; cited above, § 2), pp. 240–258; K. W. F. Solger, Vorlesungen über Aesthetik (Leipz.: 1829), p. 267 ff.; F. Biese, Die Philosophie des Aristoteles (1842), Bd. II, 725–731, epic and tragedy; H. Wedewer, Ueber die epische Sagenpoesie mit besond. Berücksichtigung ihrer Wichtigkeit u. Bedeutung in stofflicher Beziehung (Progr. 1857); R. Zimmermann, Allgemeine Aesthetik (2 vols. 1858–65), § 592 ff.; E. J. Saupe, Die Gattungen der deutschen Dichtkunst (Leipz.: 1863), — a brief compilation for use in the schools; C. Lemcke, Aesthetik (1st ed. 1865; 6th ed. 1890); A. Schopf, Nationalepos und Balladendichtung: eine ethnographische Studie (Wien: 1882); W. Scherer, Poetik (Berlin: 1888), p. 246 ff.; L. Jacobowski, Anfänge der Poesie, etc. (Dresden: 1891), see below, § 11; F. Spielhagen, Die epische Dichtung unter den wechselnden Zeichen des Verkehrs (in *Zukunft*, 17: 153–174. 1896), — the influence of means of communication on technique of the epic; C. Beyer, Deutsche Poetik (3d ed. Berlin: 1900); R. Kreller, Die Völkerwanderung von Hermann Lingg und das Gesetz der epischen Einheit (München: 1900); R. Prölz (1904. Cited above, § 3), § 77; R. Lehmann (1908. Cited above, § 3); W. Schwartzkopff, Rede und Redeszene in der deutschen Erzählung bis Wolfram von Eschenbach (in *Palaestra*, 74); E. Weber, Die epische Dichtung (Leipz.: 1909), for German schools.

IX. For **Dutch** and **Spanish** criticism, see above, § 3, VII. Several early Dutch critics have been mentioned above, under German epic criticism; another famous early Dutch work, of great contemporary influence, was Gerardus Vossius' De Artis Poeticae Natura ac Constitutione Liber (Amsterdam: 1647), the third book of which deals with the epic.

X. **Sanskrit.** In Sanskrit critical literature the student finds the extreme development of rule, recipe, and commentary. Scores of lengthy and minute commentaries on the texts (Mallinātha, e.g., explains every word of Kālidāsa's Raghuvaṃça); hundreds of elaborate rules about "various forms of alliteration and figures of speech"; directions that the subjects for an epic must be derived from the old epics, that the fable should be extensive and "embellished with descriptions of cities, seas, mountains, seasons, sunrise, weddings, battles fought by the hero, and so forth," — all this and much more to the same effect illustrates the pseudo-classicism of the artificial (Kāvya) epic and epic criticism of the Hindoos. References may be found on pp. 433–434 of A. A. Macdonell's Hist. of Sanskrit Literature (N. Y.: 1900). Very little of the Sanskrit poetics is available in translation; but the student may consult Daṇḍin's Kāvyādarça (Mirror of Poetry, end of 6th century), ed. with trans. by Böhtlingk (Leipz.: 1890).

CHAPTER IV

HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENT

SECTION 10. STATEMENT OF PROBLEMS; ANALYSIS

For general methods of historical study see the introductory remarks of § 4, above.

No theories advanced concerning the function or the technique of a literary species are trustworthy unless they rest upon an historical and scientific basis. The characteristics of the epic should be studied not as static, but as dynamic. Acquaintance with the laws of growth will lead to the appreciation of the necessity and fitness of typical features that otherwise might appear invented or arbitrary. The following questions are suggested:

I. What is the Origin of the Epic?

A. *Psychological.* Under this head may be considered the origin of narrative as such, irrespective of that particular narrative form known as the epic. (1) What manner of thought — emotional, imaginative, or reflective — does primitive man pursue and desire to express? Is it preponderantly emotional, and the purpose of its expression merely the physical discharge of feeling? Or is it primarily a set of images of events, which are expressed for self-gratulatory and commemorative purposes? or a combination of images and strong feelings with a complex purpose of expression, — emotional discharge plus celebration and commemoration? (2) *A priori*, what species of poetry would naturally correspond to this manner of thought and be its natural vehicle of expression, — lyric or narrative? or a form containing lyric, narrative, and dramatic elements as yet undifferentiated? Is it possible that the beginnings of the lyric and of rhythmic narrative are simultaneous?

Compare above, § 4, 1, The Beginnings of the Lyric. (3) What evidence is there that original lyrical, allusive celebration of an event is transformed to narrative recital when the event has receded so far into the past that the lyrical allusions to it are vague and there is need of a full and definite account of the event (retrospective origin of narrative)? See Gummere. (4) Does narrative originate in the savage's imaginative answers to primitive questions about the facts of physical and social environment (aetiological origin of narrative), the answers necessarily involving narrative because primitive man thinks in terms of human (animistic) agency? See Kurtz, Chap. IV, and p. 175; Waterman. Is not such narrative generally in prose, as distinct from rhythmic, form? Does it antedate rhythmic narrative of actual events? Has it any influence upon rhythmic narrative of events? Compare Beatty, and remarks upon Grosse. Does primitive man distinguish the two forms? (5) Behind primitive rhythmic narrative is there an individualistic impulse, or only a communal 'feeling-storm'? In other words, is primitive narrative the product of a poetizing — dancing, singing, extemporizing — crowd (communal theory)? See Gayley and Scott, pp. 266–274; cf. Moulton, Mod. Study of Lit., on 'floating' *vs.* 'fixed' poetry. Are both sorts of narrative (epical and aetiological) the product of communal authorship? If there be a transition from communal song to narrative, by way of retrospection, is it accomplished by a communal song that "oscillates between production and reproduction, that is, between improvisation and memory"? See Gummere. Or is it accomplished, at request, by older individuals whose memory extends back to the original events? (6) What justification may be advanced for the theory of those who, scouting the theory of a poetizing crowd, '*das dichtende Volk*,' cling to individual authorship and an historical development by individual imitation, combination, invention in conformity with the changing material and taste of successive ages? (7) In what ways — according to what laws of development — are mental growth and the evolution of artistic (narrative) expression associated?

Do the "deliberation and conscious art" which differentiate artistic from natural expression wait upon higher stages of mental development? Are they subsequent to the mental stage that expresses itself in communal narrative? Or is the "old alliance of spontaneous production and living memory" not yet broken up, — the fecund environment in which the "Homer, whoever or whatever he may be, can work out the perfect union of art and nature"? See Gummere.

The answers to these questions are to be sought in *a priori* psychological speculation, in anthropological accounts of the customs, beliefs, and mental habits of primitive folk, and in induction from such primitive rhythmic expression as we possess. *A priori* speculation underlies all attempts at depicting the mind of the savage and at explaining his methods of expression; anthropology and the critical study of primitive 'texts' seek to check and corroborate speculative theory. Of anthropological accounts we may refer to E. B. Tylor, Primitive Culture; J. G. Frazer, Golden Bough; A. Lang, Myth, Ritual, and Religion; W. Wundt, Völkerpsychologie; A. Vierkandt, Naturvölker und Kulturvölker; J. Dewey, Interpretation of Savage Mind (*Psychological Review*, vol. IX, No. 3); Boas, The Mind of the Savage. Suggestive material on the psychology of the throng may be found in Gustave Le Bon's The Crowd, E. Ross' Social Psychology, and W. McDougall's Introduction to Social Psychology, though these do not deal with primitives. For literary theory see in § 11 the works of the following: Gummere, Jacobowski, Grosse, Steinthal, Posnett, Hirn, ten Brink, Hegel, Symonds, Mure, Jebb, Loise, Stedman pp. 94–97, Gayley and Scott pp. 266–274, where further references may be found. For studies of primitive texts: Grosse, Macculloch, Mackenzie, Kurtz. For criticism of the communal theory: Lang, Wilamowitz, Foulet, Terret, Henderson. Further notice of the two chief theories, below, under IX, A, Ballad.

B. *Historical.* Here may be considered not the origin of the narrative element but of the epic as such. The theories of origin have reference to the original or folk epic (Iliad, Odyssey, Beowulf, Nibelungenlied, Roland, Cid, etc.) as distinguished from the imitative or art epic (Argonautica, Aeneid, Paradise Lost, etc.). But the student should always remember that this distinction is itself open to criticism (see under C. B. Bradley, § 8, above), and that therefore it may be necessary to abandon in some part the evolutionary or progressive theory of epic origin.

1. *The Evolutionary Theory.* The evolutionary theory supposes in general that the folk epic is the product not of an individual author, as was Paradise Lost, but that it is composed of many more or less anonymous parts finally arranged by some bard or editor whose task was one of compilation, not creation. The theory divides into various schools of opinion concerning the nature of the parts and the method of their compilation. (*a*) Some hold the *Kleine Lieder* theory, that the epic is a "collection of short lays disposed in sequence in a late age" (Vico, Blackwell, D'Aubignac, C. G. Heyne, F. A. Wolf, Lachmann, Murray, and others). (*b*) Others that it contains "an ancient original 'kernel' round which 'expansions,' made throughout some centuries of changeful life, have accrued, and have at last been arranged by a literary editor or redactor" (Hermann, Grote, Jebb, Leaf). (*c*) Still others modify and harmonize these theories: if the epic is "made up of a series of heroic songs, strung together with little or no modification, these songs must have been something very different" in degree "from the popular ballad; they must have been highly developed examples of the poetry of art" (Hart). Compare Ker's statement that Teutonic poetry shows that the epic may be developed out of short lays through increase in style-length (Epic and Romance, pp. 105 ff., 168–169). Of the French *chansons de geste*, epical songs that were sung by professional *jongleurs* (cf. Homeric ἀοιδοί), which probably can be traced back to the tenth century and of which the Chanson de Roland is "the earliest and best example," Léon Gautier wrote: "Our first epic poets did not actually and materially patch together pre-existent *cantilènes* [short songs sung not by professional minstrels, but by the crowd in chorus; traces of them in 7th century]. They were only inspired by these popular songs; they only borrowed from them the traditional and legendary elements. In short, they took nothing from them but the

ideas, the spirit, the life; they 'found' (ils ont trouvé) all the rest" (quoted by Monro, Art. Homer, Encyc. Brit., from Les épopées françaises, vol. I, 2d ed., 1878, p. 80; in the first ed., 1865, Gautier had held that the *chansons de geste* were formed by patching together 'bunches' of the earlier *cantilènes*). Compare Paul Meyer on the improbability of the chansons having been formed from cantilènes (Rech. sur l'épopée fr., pp. 65–66). — The cantilènes of Spain did not attain epic form; neither did the ballads of Serbia. According to Gaston Paris (Hist. poétique de Charlemagne, p. 9) the national songs of Scandinavia, Lithuania, and Russia have developed only part way toward the epic. What of 'ballad' poetry in other nations? What of antecedent lays for other so-called folk epics (Beowulf; Indian, Persian, and Homeric epics)? Of Teutonic epical poetry Professor Chadwick says:

> Four well-marked stages may be distinguished in the history of Teutonic heroic poetry. The first is that of strictly contemporary court poetry, dealing with the praises or the adventures of living men. The second is that of epic or narrative court poetry, which celebrates the deeds of heroes of the past, though not of a very remote past. The third is the popular stage, during which the same stories were handled by village minstrels. The last stage is that in which the old subjects again found favour with the nobility in Germany and were treated in a new form which reflected the conditions of the age of chivalry (The Heroic Age).

Note also Christ, Croiset (§ 12, below), Steinthal, Heusler, etc. — But to classify by schools of opinion were a fruitless task, so numerous the possibilities of scientific divergence, and so kaleidoscopic the combinations offered by individual authorities. For further references see below, § 11; also under history of the epic by nationalities, § 12, I.

2. *Individualistic Theory.* Those who hold this theory believe the earlier songs afford materials for the inspiration of the individual poet or poets, composer or composers, whose task is one of invention, creation, rather than compilation. See Nitzsch, Gautier, Meyer, Terret, Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, etc. It is to

be noted, furthermore, that this theory makes no sharp differentiation between the methods of composition of the so-called folk and art epics. Perhaps there may be some essential difference in the character and the degree of elaboration of the popular materials as they come to the poet's hand (Bradley); but that remains to be shown. Perhaps the distinction should be made between those epics which use only indigenous 'national' material (Homeric epics, chansons de geste) and those that are cosmopolitan and selective in their sources (Paradise Lost, Aeneid, Divine Comedy). Are not the great national epics of indigenous material closer to their immediate sources, in point of time and understanding, than the cosmopolitan epics? Are they not closer to oral tradition and oral forms of poetry? Do they acquire a greater ease of movement and simplicity from this contiguity with oral forms? See Monro, Art. Homer, Encyc. Brit.

3. *Relation to the Lyric.* From the comparative study of early literatures what do we ascertain as to the relative periods of the finished folk epic and lyric? (*a*) Is there any uniform order of precedence? (*b*) In certain literatures are there not traces of a great lyric flowering which preceded the epic? May such traces be found in the epics themselves, of India, Greece, Rome, Germany, England, Finland, Scotland, Norway? (*c*) In the Old Testament is the epic-lyric order of development merely an *a priori* speculation? On these problems see Victor Hugo, Posnett, Jebb, Herder, Müller, Donaldson, Jacobowski, ten Brink, Schopenhauer, Hegel, Hapgood, Steinthal, Wackernagel pp. 86–90 and 156–164, and, in general, disquisitions on the Iliad and the Odyssey. In discussions under this head, the term 'folk song,' or 'folk poetry,' should be carefully defined as a precautionary measure. There may be considerable difference between songs sung by the folk and songs composed by the folk. See Steinthal, p. 2 ff.

4. *Origin, Distribution, and Transformation of Epical Stories.* Whether or not one accepts the evolutionary theory of epic authorship the truth is that with few exceptions the epic makes use of myth, legend, and tradition. The origin and distribution

of these stories, a great part of which may be denominated folk tales, is in itself a huge and vastly interesting study. Whether or not all variants of a story, or how many of them, go back to one original; whether that original was the product of primitive or early folk invention, or of later, premeditated authorship; whether it originated as a literal belief of untutored minds, or in playful romancing; whether the story was originally aetiological or allegorical or for the purpose of mere amusement; what were the conditions of its distribution, and the causes and interrelation of its variants; how it was amalgamated with other stories, and won or lost significance, humor, or pathos; under what circumstances and in what form it was taken up into the epic: these are some of the alluring questions of mythology and folklore. See Child, Jensen, Foulet, Gautier, Chadwick, Rajna, etc.

But so far as the epic is concerned, something more than an investigation of its sources is involved in this study. (*a*) How does epic handling modify the form, content, and spirit of myth? Do the gods take on more and more of human sentiment and passion (contrast the beast-gods of primitive belief and the talking beasts of fairy tales), and lose the traits of their original nature-meaning? Are the gods' adventures multiplied, and their moral purposes rendered nobler? Do they become more decidedly and extensively ideals of human virtue and vice? Do they become ideals of an heroic age — heroes painted upon the clouds? and do they lose, *pari passu*, their religious, cultural significance? Does primitive fear of the gods yield to a reverential, or at least a plastic, idealism? See Wundt's Völkerpsychologie, Bd. 2, Tl. 2, pp. 607–608 (Leipz.: 1905); also Immisch, Usener, Wackernagel, and Gummere, as noted below, § 11. (*b*) Or is the epic itself a means of exalting heroes to gods (euhemerism)? See W. Müller. (*c*) How in turn do the form and content of myth affect the conduct of epic narrative? Does the poet find in the gods an ever-present, popular means of imparting to heroic legend the elevated or sublime atmosphere which his hearers have felt and he must convey? Does myth supply the motivation and, consequently, the more than casual significance of heroic events? Is the poet limited in any way, in any degree, by the actual forms of myth? Does he imitate the forms of the myth? (*d*) Similarly, we may inquire how far epic handling has modified legend and tradition, and how far it has been controlled by them.

The proper method of studying these questions consists, of course, in comparing pre-epical song and story with the epopee. But in the majority of cases we lack the actual form from which a given epic poet derived (unless, to be sure, we accept the *Kleine Lieder* theory and believe we can by analysis separate the lays that have been stitched together). It is necessary, therefore, to have recourse to less direct methods. Assuming that the myths and legends of present-day primitive and barbaric races are analogous to those from which the great folk epics of the past derived, we may compare the mythic and heroic stuff of the epic with these known stories; or, assuming that the epics were derived from forms analogous to our old ballads and heroic lays, we may compare the latter, as regards content, structure, spirit, and scope, with epic content and handling. For examples of such methods or approaches to them, see Chadwick, Hart, Heusler, Jebb, Murray, Ker, Krohn, Panzer, Laveleye, Meier, Jacobowski (Primitive Erzählungskunst), Mackenzie, Macculloch, Voretzsch, etc. But for carrying on these methods successfully the student must turn to the accumulations and knowledge of the anthropologist and student of folklore (see, for a brief introduction, the article Folklore, with selected bibliography, in the Encyc. Brit.; for a huge bibliography see the footnotes of Frazer's Golden Bough). The anthropologists have themselves studied the folk epics and have succeeded in throwing much light upon epical customs and beliefs (see A. Lang's Homer and his Age, 1906, with which compare the same author's The Homeric Hymns, 1899; W. Ridgeway's The Early Age of Greece; Chadwick's Heroic Age; Klenze, as noted below, § 11; Michel Bréal, Pour mieux connaître Homère, 1906; further bibliography in T. D. Seymour's Life in the Homeric Age).

Here, too, we must ask which is nearer to historical fact, — the epical lay or the epopee? Is the lay or saga a connecting link between history and epopee? See Schneegans, Voretzsch; cf. above, § 7, II, B, The Subject of the Epic.

An examination of the later art epics to determine how in them myth, legend, and history have been employed — perhaps transformed — will contribute something toward the solution of many problems mentioned in this division. Such investigation appears especially promising when we remember that the distinction between folk and art epic is perhaps a vanishing one (Bradley). What was the practice of Virgil, Dante, Ariosto, Tasso, Milton, Klopstock, Goethe (Hermann und Dorothea)?

II. **Stages of Development.** The comparative study of folk epic and ballad, lay, gest, etc., to which we have just referred, may lead to generalizations as to the typical stages of the evolution of heroic poetry. Compare below, § 12, I, B. For attempts to sketch the order of development see Chadwick (as quoted above), Nitzsch, Steinthal, Gautier, Marsh, Myers; compare Ker, Hart, Heusler, Panzer, Mackenzie, Posnett, Gunkel, Laveleye, Krohn, Gummere, Wackernagel, Véron, Loise, etc.

In general, stages of development may be marked with reference to: (1) inner form of the poem, as its construction of plot and episode, its setting, handling of character, style-length, addition of incidents, etc. (see Hart, Heusler, and Ker); (2) outer form, as the single story (isolated form); the fusion of two or more stories — often by splitting one and inserting another — which leads to the collection of several into a gest or cycle (agglutinative form); and the final re-composition in the epopee (organic form) (see Steinthal, Laveleye, and Gunkel; cf. Nitzsch and Krohn); (3) stages of religion or government, or social stratification, reflected in the poems (see Myers, Posnett, Véron, and Loise; also below, § 12, I, B); (4) manner of presentation, as orally by contemporary court bard, later court bard, popular minstrel; or in some written form (see Chadwick; cf. Marsh). The last method involves the important question of the influence of oral and written methods of publication upon the form and development of heroic narrative (see Gummere, Wackernagel, Chadwick, Steinthal, Krohn, Panzer, Henderson, etc.; also the writers upon the Homeric Question, as noted below, pp. 672–675).

III. **What Period in National Civilization seems best fitted to the Production of Heroic Poetry and the Folk Epic?** Heroic poetry is a recurring historical phenomenon; so too is the epopee, in which some bodies of heroic poetry have culminated (Chadwick). What were the characteristics of the civilizations in which these poetic forms flourished? What conditions foster the development of a great national epic? See Blackwell, Hegel, Lotze, Posnett, W. von Humboldt (§§ xcv–xcvi; work cited above, § 8), Gautier, Héricault, Hugo, Loise. Compare Ker's statement (*op. cit.*, p. 18) that the dignity of the epic is conformable to the spirit of the heroic age and is not "attained by a process of abstraction and separation from the meanness of familiar things." See Ker further, p. 23, for the characteristics of the age that gives to the hero an epic importance. — In particular: (1) Is an agricultural society unfavorable to the preservation of heroic poetry? an aristocratic, military society? commercial? Hapgood, Posnett. (2) Is epical poetry (heroic poetry on the road to epopee) a product of the conflict of nationalities, or of their fusion? And does the epopee tell a story that was the original possession of one race (often the conquered race, as Achaeans or British) but has become the ideal of the amalgamated race of conquerors and the conquered? And is it characteristic of this process that no memory should be retained of the fact that the stories belonged first of all to one race only? See Lemcke, Krohn, Marsh. (3) Does the epopee appear in an age when wonder-loving traditions are giving place to history? Cf. Schneegans. (4) Only in an age of wealth, leisure, and writing? Cf. Marsh, Posnett. (5) At the apex or first decline of a communal civilization, when individualism is already remaking customs and beliefs? Is the epopee the swan-song of a civilization? Cf. the Homeric poems. (6) Or is the epopee a sign of, and stimulus to, a new nationalism? (7) Is implicit belief in its myths and marvels a characteristic of its age? a necessary characteristic? Hapgood.

IV. **Development of the Art Epic.** In general an art epic imitates indigenous folk epics and (or) previous art epics. To trace the development of art epics consists, therefore, in determining the kind and degree of imitation and variation involved in successive examples. What, in other words, are the principles of imitation and variation involved in the history of the art epic? These principles, obviously, are of a psychological character and belong to the psychology of imitation and invention.

The student, therefore, should fortify himself with a knowledge of the psychology of imitation and invention, both as respects the general operations of the human mind and the more particular phenomena of literary genius, so far as it has been observed and reduced to general statements. Little enough of such science has been furnished us. Here and there in the treatises on psychology a few suggestions occur. Ribot's Essay on the Creative Imagination (English trans. by A. H. N. Baron, Chicago: 1906) is helpful, and contains references to allied works. The sociological aspects of imitation have been studied, as noted above, by Gabriel Tarde, E. Ross, and W. McDougall. Essays on the nature of genius have to be taken with a grain of salt, but occasionally they offer something for our purposes (references in Gayley and Scott, p. 138).

The European series of epics deriving from Homer (and at a later period further fructified by imitation of the heroic and romantic narratives of the Dark and Middle Ages) offers a tempting opportunity for original investigation of the actual principles of imitation and variation. Such a series as the epics of Homer, Apollonius of Rhodes, Virgil, Lucan, Quintus Smyrnaeus, Trissino, Tasso, Ronsard, Chapelain, Voltaire, Milton, Klopstock — to mention only a few — might well be made the basis of a study that would endeavor to answer these and other related questions: To what extent does each poem follow previous epics in respect to plot, characterization, development of situation, diction, etc., etc.? What variations in these respects may be noted? What generalizations can be made as to the *sort* of details that are imitated, and the *sort* that are varied? as to the *methods* of imitation and variation? the *causes*? Do the same principles hold for imitation and variation in all the poems? in groups of poems?

In general the inner spirit of successive European epics has been very different, but imitation of models has tended to restrain variation in the outer form. Can a method be devised for measuring, as a ratio, the relative degree of variation in the inner spirit and outer form of a poem as compared with those of its models or prototype? Or must we limit observation to the details of outer form?

For further suggestions of problems of development see below, § 12.

V. **What classification of the epic may be made** in consideration of its origin (popular or artificial), or of its development? This question may be regarded as referring to the chronological or historical course of the epic poetry of one nation, or to its development on a broader ethnical and comparative plane.

A. Through the history of the epos of any one nation may be traced a growth (1) of personal consciousness, (2) of artistic expression. What classification of the epic may be made on each of these bases? And which is preferable? Steinthal, Hegel, Posnett. Is the absence of personal revelation on the part of the epic author due to the early subordination of the individual to communal life? Can the distinction between a romantic, agglutinative stage of epic composition (e.g., the Cid), and an organic epic stage (e.g., the Iliad), be shown to coincide with a difference in the degree of the singer's personal consciousness of the events narrated? See Steinthal, p. 2 ff. Do we find in the Greek epic evidences of communal material handled in a later individualistic spirit? Immisch.

B. Under the comparative study of epics, the student will remark interesting variations in the religious attitude of typical characters, in the unity of narrative, in the personality behind poetic expression, as he advances from the epic of the East to the epic of the West, from the epic of the folk to the epic of the artist, from the age of faith to the age of reason. See Watts-Dunton (Encyc. Brit.), Herder, Hegel, Posnett, etc. (1) What stage of religious belief finds its expression most fitly in epic form?

(2) Explain ethnic and geographical variations of the epic type. (3) Of what merit are the following schemes of the evolution of the epic? and what is in each case the basis of classification? (*a*) the naïve or primitive epic, and the literary, learned, or artistic epic (cf. Ker, p. 34); (*b*) the hero-saga, the composite or agglutinative epic, the artistic; (*c*) the 'fatalistic,' the 'self-assertive,' the 'altruistic'; (*d*) the folk epic, the national epic, the 'cosmopolitan' epic; (*e*) the lyric epic, the epic proper, the dramatic epic; (*f*) the naïve, the reflective, the artistic; (*g*) Hegel's stages of development, Aesthetik, vol. III, p. 398 ff.

C. A much narrower but plausibly practicable method of comparative study is that employed by many of the earlier English and French critics, who, taking the Iliad as the paragon of epics, attempt to grade by one scale other epics of all times and periods. This fashion of criticism can be commended only as a means of first approach. It will inform the student concerning the characteristics of the type ordinarily considered to be best; but since it premises what it ought to prove, it leads to no conclusion concerning the historical characteristics of the type. This is the style of criticism represented by Vida, Boileau, Dryden, Addison, and most of the writers of the Classical School. See above, §§ 7, 8, 9.

VI. **Is the Age of Epic Composition Past?** Consider the relation of literary epics, such as Paradise Lost, or of the combination epic, Kalevala, to the conditions of the periods in which they were produced. See Hegel and Schopenhauer on the type of literature required by the tendencies of modern thought, taste, and activity; also in § 11, 'W. J.' and Duchesne. See Herder on the possibility of a new and more splendid epic. Can romance and the novel supersede the epic? Consider the literary epics of the nineteenth century: Jason, Light of Asia, Light of the World, Saul, Epic of Hades, etc. Compare also W. Jordan, Epische Briefe, No. III.

VII. To what extent does the history of the epic warrant the opinion that the metrical romance, idyl, and even the novel, are differentiations, or even sub-species, of the epic? See among others Brockhaus' Konversations-Lex.; Moulton, Mod. Study of Lit., p. 132 ff.; Elze, Grundr. d. eng. Phil., pp. 356–357. Is it possible that hero-saga and ballad are not representative of pre-epic lays? Henderson. Is it true that, generally speaking, great popular hero-epics are not found in nations where the hero-ballad has been developed extensively? See Wülker, p. 244, and compare the practice of Russians, Serbians, Croatians, Bulgarians, Siberian Tartars, Celts, and ancient Scandinavians (Comparetti, pp. viii, 327).

VIII. What relation exists between the epic proper and the imitative folk epic, the allegory, metrical romance, the idyl, the ballad, the animal epic, the dramatic epic, the didactic poem, the metaphysical or scientific epic, the heroic poem, the mock-heroic poem? On a distinction between epic poetry (or the epopee) and the epos, see Wackernagel, p. 95, and Steinthal. Is the epic a complex, comprehensive type in which most of the other kinds may be included? Ker, p. 18. Consider the epic features, if any, in such works as the following:

The Theogony and the Works and Days of Hesiod, the Saga of the Well-and-Wise-Walking Khan, the Saga of Ardschí-Bordschi (in Sagas from the Far East. Lond.: 1873), the Thibetan Tales of Schiefner and Ralston (Lond.: 1882), Spenser's Faerie Queene, Macpherson's Ossian's Fingal, the Campaign of Addison, the Lutrin of Boileau, the Hero and Leander of Musaeus (and the English adaptations of it by Marlowe and Chapman and by Edwin Arnold), the Rape of the Lock, Hudibras, William Tennant's Anster Fair, Tennyson's Princess and the Idylls of the King, William Morris' House of the Wolfings, the Roots of the Mountains, Earthly Paradise, Lewis Morris' Epic of Hades, Wilkinson's Saul, Wordsworth's Excursion, Coleridge's Ancient Mariner and Christabel, Byron's Childe Harold, Don Juan, Bride of Abydos, Scott's Marmion, etc., Keats' Endymion and Hyperion, Fletcher's Purple Island, Sir Richard Blackmore's The Creation (see *Spectator*, No. 339), Lucretius' De Rerum Natura, Darwin's Botanical Garden, Chaucer's Canterbury Tales, Nonne Priestes Tale, and House of Fame, Davenant's Gondibert, Lang's Helen of Troy, Gosse's Firdausi in Exile, Matthew Arnold's Sohrab and Rustum, and Balder Dead, Swinburne's Tristram of Lyonesse, Browning's The Ring and the Book, Longfellow's Evangeline, Lowell's Vision of Sir Launfal, the Battle of Brunanburh, Cynewulf's Elene, the Traveller's Song, Judith, the cycles of Alexander, Charlemagne, and Arthur, the Romaunt of the Rose, Sir Gawayne and the Green Knight, von Eschenbach's Parzival, Langland's Vision concerning Piers Plowman, Goethe's Hermann und Dorothea. For other examples of poems with possibly an epic flavor, see Gummere's chapter on the Epic (Poetics).

IX. **Minor Forms of Narrative Poetry.** These have been suggested above, § 7, VII, where will be found an enumeration of the chief varieties and a brief consideration of the nature of Ballad, Pastoral, and Idyl. The following notes are intended for the beginner in the fields of study to which they pertain.

A. *Ballad.* 1. *Origin.* That the popular or traditional ballad is folk poetry, i.e., poetry that has originated usually in oral form, among a homogeneous, non-literary people, and has been handed down among them by word of mouth, is generally conceded. See Kittredge, xii–xiii; cf. Moulton on fossil poetry, Mod. Study of Lit., 32–33. But the exact method of origin is a question still under discussion. Two theories, which after all are probably not incompatible, have been advanced. (*a*) *The Theory of Individual Authorship.* Ballads, say some, are composed by individuals, just as a modern lyric or narrative poem is the work of a particular author. They achieve popularity as catchy songs do nowadays; from transmission by word of mouth from one generation to another they take on certain distinctive traits of popular rehearsal, such as repetitions, stock expressions, naïve phrasing and point of view. But is it not nearer to the evidence to suppose that the ballad-poet, an undistinguished member of the mass or crowd, composes in the artless and popular vein of which practically everybody else in the crowd is capable (such improvisation is not at all unusual among those of the unliterary class)? And is it not nearer to the evidence to suppose that the ballad-poet makes use of the stock phrases, settings, and situations of earlier ballads, instead of striving for novel conceptions and expressions that will distinguish his work from that of other poets? The ballad-maker is the mouthpiece of the crowd; his subject is matter of common knowledge; and his production at once becomes the possession of the people. Usually his authorship is unregarded or forgotten; his composition becomes as anonymous as it was impersonal. Of such authorship we have an account in the following notice of Serbian ballads:

> The anonymous authorship of these songs may excite surprise among a people of bookish training and habits. It will readily be understood that a singer knowing some fifty of the ballads by heart can without great difficulty compose new songs on any passing event of village life, even as a cultivated gentleman, well versed in even one of Shakespeare's plays, can find fitting quotations for an after-dinner speech on any imaginable topic. Karájich gives an example of such a jesting song composed upon a village wedding. Ballads of this type have no value in themselves, and disappear from memory along with the trifling event that occasioned them. But "just as waggish old men and youths compose these jocose songs, so others compose serious ballads of battles and other notable events. It is not strange that one cannot learn who first composed even the most recent of the ballads, to say nothing of the older ones; but it is strange that among the common people nobody regards it as an art or a thing to be proud of to compose a new ballad; and, not to speak of boasting of doing so, everyone, even the real author, refuses to acknowledge the ballad, and says that he has heard it from another. This is true of the most recent ballads, of which it is known that they were not brought from elsewhere, but arose on the spot from an event of a few days ago; but when even a year has passed since the event and the ballad, or when a ballad is heard of an event of yesterday, but of a distant locality, no one even thinks of asking about its origin." . . . Acquaintance with these simple statements by Karájich as to conditions with which he was familiar, in a country where ballads are still a living force, might have saved writers on English balladry from much empty theorizing. Despite the prevailing anonymity, the authorship of some of the modern ballads is known with reasonable certainty (G. R. Noyes and L. Bacon, Heroic Ballads of Servia, Boston: 1913, pp. 9–10; Karájich, Preface to 2d ed. of Servian National Songs, 1824, government ed. 1891).

(*b*) *Communal Theory.* But though the authorship of individual ballads — including our three hundred and five English and Scottish ballads — is probably to be accounted for by the modified individualistic theory which has just been suggested, yet the question of the origin of the ballad as a type remains to be considered. And a virtue of the modified individualistic theory is that it welcomes the communal theory as an answer to this question of type-origin, but clearly discourages the absurd misinterpretation of the latter that attributes the authorship of our ballads in their present form to a dancing, improvising throng.

According to the communal theory, if we wish to discover the singing narrative — with its popular refrain, burden, or chorus, with its naïve, monotonous repetitions, with its utter simpleness of conception and expression — which in the course of time evolves the ballad of sustained developed narrative, we must go to the communal choral, improvised by various members of a primitive dancing, singing crowd that is celebrating an event of common moment. Among all primitive people we find this simple communal improvisation: the song may be composed of but two or three verses, repeated hour after hour. Presumably from such songs is taken the cue for longer, sustained narrative. But, after all, by way of caution we must ask whether this connection can actually be demonstrated. And, on the other hand, is it not true that often the very people who improvise these monotonous 'shouts' possess long aetiological narratives, quite unrelated to communal improvisation? See Spencer and Gillen, Native Tribes of Australia. Is not the faculty for such narration an individual gift even among primitives? Is it not as probable that the ballad is a development from such narratives, as from the camp-fire 'shout' or 'sing'? See Beatty, and note Gummere, Pop. Ballad, 69–70.

However, the essential point remains this: that the traditional ballad, belonging to oral, 'folk' poetry, rather than to the written art poetry of the educated classes, is as a type in all probability to be traced back to very early, even primitive beginnings of some sort, but that our extant ballads are probably due in the first place to individual authorship in a naïve, unpremeditated, unstudied vein. Moreover, these extant ballads have undergone many changes of form and content during their oral transmission;

and the whole body of these popular, anonymous changes has amounted to a secondary, progressive, and collective act of composition, which is "as efficient a cause of the ballad . . . as the original creative act of the individual author" (Kittredge, p. xvii).

For an excellent concise analysis and appraisal of the theories of origin see Kittredge. On the communal theory see works by Gummere; for the individualistic theory, Henderson, Courthope, and G. G. Smith, as noted below, § 11, under Gummere, Popular Ballad. See also Child, Lang, Hart, Ker, G. M. Miller, Heusler, Steenstrup, and others noted in the outline of the history of the ballad question given by Gummere in his Introd. to his Old English Ballads (1894) and by H. Hecht, Neuere Literatur zur englisch-schottischen Balladendichtung (in *Englische Studien*, 36: 370 ff. 1906). See also Gayley and Scott, pp. 266–274.

2. *Antiquity and Distribution of the Ballad.* Although the very nature of their oral and popular existence makes an adequate history of particular ballads well-nigh impossible, yet the great antiquity of ballad-making may be fairly demonstrated. The student should note the evidences of balladry during the Middle and Dark Ages — among the Angles and Saxons when they invaded England, among the Germans, French, Danes, Scandinavians, Italians, Greeks, and others. Early manuscript references to popular narrative songs are the chief direct evidence. But most valuable is the indirect evidence which may be deduced from the wide distribution of the ballad. Ballad-versions of certain romantic themes are diffused over all Europe, which may indicate a very considerable antiquity. The comparative study of these versions soon carries the student into the larger fields of comparative folklore. Materials for such study may be found in the introductions and notes to Child's English and Scottish Popular Ballads and in the larger histories of national literatures. For an inspiring introduction to the field see Andrew Lang's article, Ballads (Encyc. Brit., 11th ed.). See also the references to folk poetry under each division in § 6, above; for early Germanic poetry, § 6, XIII, A. On sources

of English ballads see E. Flügel in *Anglia*, 21: 312 ff.; also Child, Kittredge, and Ker.

3. *Development of the Ballad, and Relation to Other Types.* What are the means and stages of accretion and internal change, with respect to both form and content, that constitute the development of the ballad (*a*) from its germ in the communal improvisation of the dancing throng to its appearance as a recognized form of popular but individual improvisation? (*b*) from an original form created by an individual author to the far different form which is the result of the many changes to which the poem is subject during oral transmission? (*c*) from the simple ballad to the ballad-cycle? Does the ballad precede or succeed the epic? Do some legendary ballads develop into heroic lays (*chansons de geste*), and these into epic? By what means and stages? What is the relation of the ballad to medieval metrical romance? For a more ample statement of these problems and a serious attempt at answering some of them, see W. M. Hart, Ballad and Epic, and English Popular Ballads, which are noted at some length in § 11, below. Compare Clawson, Comparetti's Trad. Poetry of the Finns, Ker's Epic and Romance, Gummere's Beginnings of Poetry, and Heusler's Lied und Epos, also noted in § 11.

B. *Pastoral.* A very few of the outstanding problems of the history of the pastoral are noted.

1. *Origin.* (*a*) Do pastoral people possess a distinctive pastoral poetry? Or does what we know of the songs of pastoral nations lead us "to suppose that they bear a close resemblance to the type of popular verse current wherever poetry exists, folk songs of broad humanity in which little stress is laid on the peculiar circumstances of shepherd life" (Greg, p. 4)? (*b*) Is the general assumption that Theocritus derived his materials and inspiration from the shepherds of Sicily erroneous? See Lang, Introd. to Trans. of Theocritus; Knaack, as noted below, under Idyl. Compare, in this connection, the songs of modern Greek peasants — shepherds included — with those of other pastoral and non-pastoral peoples.

For Greek specimens see C. Fauriel, Chants populaires de la Grèce moderne (1825); Lucy Garnett, several volumes (1885 +). For popular songs of other peoples see under the divisions of § 6, above.

(*c*) Are the festivals of pastoral peoples distinguished by peculiar practices and songs? (*d*) How does the art pastoral originate? This question resolves itself into (1) a study of the sources of the pastoral idyls of Theocritus, for which see below; and (2) a study of the rise of the medieval French *pastourelle*, which tells a story of the wooing of a shepherdess by a nobleman (see Bartsch, Altfranzösische Romanzen und Pastourellen (1870); G. Paris, La litt. fr. au moyen âge, §§ 122, 127, 133; an essay by Grosart in the 3d vol. of his ed. of Spenser; above, § 6, VII, B).

2. *Development.* Problems of development include: (*a*) Artificializing of the type by the Greek and Roman imitators of Theocritus (Bion, Moschus, Virgil — in Conington's Introd. to the Bucolics is a defense of Virgil) and by later imitators of Theocritus and Virgil (Calpurnius, Nemesianus, neo-Latin poets (for whom see the references noted above, § 6, V; also Macrì-Leone, as noted below, § 11, and Oporinus, En habes, lector, bucolicorum auctores, xxxviii, etc., Basle: 1546), Mantuanus, Petrarch, Tasso, Sannazaro, Guarini, Montemayor, Sidney, Spenser, Pope, and a host of others); (*b*) extension of pastoral to dramatic (Politian, Beccari, Tasso, Guarini, Fletcher, Ben Jonson, etc.) and novelistic (Longus, Sannazaro, Montemayor, Sidney, D'Urfé, Lodge, etc.) forms; (*c*) the union of Hellenic, Roman, neo-Latin, and Provençal (*vid. pastourelle*) influences in the Renaissance pastoral; (*d*) successive stages of development in the pastoral literatures of the various nations, including 17th and 18th century formalism and decay, and later revival of the 'natural' pastoral. E. K. Chambers suggests four methods by which the pastoral has at various times been rejuvenated and has escaped its "constant state of menace from the artificial elements in it": personal allusion; political, social, or religious allusions; realistic description and adaptation to new natural environment; idealistic interpretation, through exaltation of content, purification of love, and intuition of nature (English Pastorals, pp. xxxiv-xlii).

Among English pastoral poets the following are typical: Spenser, Drayton, William Browne, Nicholas Breton, John Philips, Lady Winchelsea, Pope, Ambrose Philips, Parnell, Gay, Ramsay, Jas. Thomson, John Armstrong, Matthew Green, John Dyer, John Byrom, Shenstone, Collins, Gray, Goldsmith, Thos. Warton, Beattie, Cowper, Crabbe, Burns. For others see E. K. Chambers, English Pastorals. Long lists of pastoral poets of many nations, ancient and modern, may be found in Blankenburg and Quadrio.

For some of the more important essays on pastoral poetry see Greg and Chambers as noted above, § 8; Carrara, Gosse, Hanford, Herford, Lilly, Macrì-Leone, Moorman, Mustard, Sommer, Windscheid, etc. as noted below, § 11; the principal histories of national literatures, as noted in the Appendix, especially J. A. Symonds, Renaissance in Italy, vols. IV, V Italian Lit., L. Petit de Julleville, Hist. de la langue et de la litt. française, G. Ticknor, Hist. of Spanish Lit., W. J. Courthope, Hist. Eng. Poetry, vols. II, III, and Camb. Hist. Eng. Lit.

An admirable account of the German pastoral is O. Neboliczka's Schäferdichtung und Poetik im 18. Jahrh. (in *Vierteljahrschrift für Littgesch.*, 2: 1–89). See also H. Broglé, as noted below, § 11, and Kressner, Beiträge zur Gesch. der französischen Pastoraldichtung (*Herrig's Archiv*, 1866); Weidinger, Die Schäferlyrik der franz. Vorrenaissance (Diss., München: 1893); Weinberg, Das franz. Schäferspiel in der 1. Hälfte des 17. Jahrhdts. (Diss., Heidelberg: 1884); J. Rocafort, Chap. VI of the work cited above, § 2; Rühle, Das deutsche Schäferspiel des 18. Jahrhdts. (Diss., Halle: 1885); Bertrand, La fin du classicisme (Paris: 1897). Among older essays see No. 39 of Hugh Blair's Lectures and Joseph Warton's Diss. upon Pastoral Poetry (in his Works of Virgil in Latin and English); many other essays from the 16th to the 18th century are listed under the article Hirtengedichte in Blankenburg's work noted above, § 2. See, further, the references below, under Idyl.

C. *Idyl.* The origin and development of the idyl well illustrate the peculiar confusion and variation of terms and materials that constitute the progress of a literary type. Questions of origin center about the poems of Theocritus. These were of various kinds: mimes, bucolics, epical romances, lyrics, epigrams, etc. What may have been the relation of Theocritus' poems to the origin and development of each of these kinds — whether, for instance, he originated the bucolic by direct imitation of rural *débat* or, which was in all probability the case, followed a contemporary school of poetry and became the "exponent of that school in its purest form" — must, of course, be studied in detail. But, as we have already noted (above, § 7, VII, C), the term εἰδύλλια (signifying 'little-pieces' or short poems) was applied by Alexandrian grammarians to the collected poems of Theocritus, — to all the kinds alike. Then began a confusion. In some way the term εἰδύλλια gathered special connotation from the pastoral poems in the collection but continued to be applied to all the poems, — mimes, epical romances, lyrics, etc.

From this point on the student may elucidate how Roman, medieval, and modern poets have, on the one hand, intensified the pastoral quality of the idyl and, on the other, extended the more general application of the term to cover a range of subjects and manners even more diverse than those included in the 'short poems' of Theocritus. Thus variation in the usage of the term has rendered even more complex the consideration of the nature of the sub-type 'idyl,' until the critic who would test the validity of a type or sub-type by its logical adherence to a specific quality is ready in despair to forget the differential of growth, return to the original meaning of the term, and define the idyl as a miniature of any one of the major types or of any combination of them.

Among more particular subjects of inquiry we may note the following: (1) Can it be shown that the pastoral idyl goes back of its art form, as given it by Philetas and the Coan school, to an original folk form? And if so, did this form originate in connection with the worship of Artemis? as rustic *débat*? See Knaack. (2) Can the essential reaction from town life be regarded as the new modifying influence upon the older folk type, which produced a new species? (3) In what social environment does the idyl flourish? (4) Is the idyl found in Oriental literature, and what does its Oriental form prove as to the essential character and development of the species? See Moulton and Gosche. (5) How much of the history of the idyl is a history of the imitation of previous literary forms — especially of Theocritus and Virgil?

Where does the student find a recrudesence of the original idyl, deriving from direct observation of life? Compare in this respect with the elegy. (6) To what extent and under what conditions has the idyl presented life in conventionalized prettiness? (7) Trace the relation of the idyl to the development of the love for nature. (8) Did a new idyllic ideal mark the transition from the Middle Ages to the Renaissance? Did the sensuous susceptibility to beauty which was characteristic of the Renaissance find a fit expression in the idyl? Or was the Renaissance idyl — Italian, French, Spanish, and English — an insincere embroidering upon ancient models? Did the Renaissance idyl derive from both Virgil and Theocritus? From which the more? (9) Have the rustic scenes and idealization of nature afforded by pastoral idyls ever affected the peasant-class, either directly or indirectly? (10) Has the idyl been an instrument of political satire, moral or economic education, religious interpretation, imaginative freedom?

Among writers of idyls are Theocritus, Bion, Moschus, Virgil, Valerius Cato, Septimius Serenus, Severus Endelechius, Ausonius (Idyllia, or possibly Epyllia?), Claudian, Nemesianus, Calpurnius Siculus, — see the neo-Latin writers as collected by Oporinus (noted above, under B, Pastoral, 2), Sacchetti, Petrarch, Mantuanus, Tasso, other Italians as noted in G. Ferrario's Poesie pastorali e rusticali (in Classici Italiani, vol. 235. Milano: 1808), Montemayor, Guiraut Riquier, Marcabrun, Thibaut de Navarre, Clément Marot, Ronsard, Honoré d'Urfé, Théophile de Viau, Saint-Amant, Mme. Deshoulières (Idylles, 1675), Fontenelle, Houdar de Lamotte, Florian, Roucher, Bernardin de Saint-Pierre, André Chénier, Victor de Laprade (Idylles héroïques, 1858; cf. Tennyson's Idylls of the King), Brizeux (Marie), Autran (Poèmes de la mer), Mistral (Mireille), Gessner (in prose, 1758), Voss (Luise, 1784), Friedrich Müller (known as 'Maler Müller'), Goethe (Alexis und Dora, Hermann und Dorothea), J. P. Hebbel, Martin Usteri, Platen, Kosegarten, Ed. Mörike, B. Auerbach, J. Gotthelf, Spenser (Shepherd's Calendar), Burns (Cotter's Saturday Night), Tennyson, various English pastoral poets mentioned above (under B, Pastoral, 2), and the authors of the books of Ruth, Tobit, Esther, and Song of Solomon. Many other names are noted by Blankenburg and Quadrio. See also Hall's Idylls of Fishermen (noted below).

On the Greek and Roman idyl see G. Knaack, Art. Bukolik, in Pauly-Wissowa, Real-Encyc. (1899), and the same author's Hellenistische Forschungen,—authoritative, indispensable, with valuable bibliographical references; P. E. Legrand, Étude sur Théocrite (Paris: 1898),—comprehensive, indispensable; Ribbeck, Die Idyllen des Theokrit (in *Preuss. Jahrb.*, 1873, 32: 59–98), popular; R. von Reitzenstein, Epigramm und Skolion (Giessen: 1893), Chap. IV,—discredited,—cf. Crusius in *Litt. Centralbl.*, 1894, 724, and Knaack in *Berl. phil. Wochenschr.*, 1895, 1160; Holm, Gesch. Siciliens (n.d.), 2: 298–321, 493; C. Haeberlin, Carmina Figurata Graeca (2d ed. Hannover: 1887), and Epilegomena (in *Philol.*, N. F. 3: 649), many errors; the histories of Greek, Alexandrian (esp. Couat and Croiset), and Roman literature as cited in Appendix; the works of Cholmeley, Mackail, Symonds, and Chambers noted above, § 8; A. C. Clark, Art. Theocritus, Encyc. Brit., 11th ed. For Virgil's Eclogues see particularly Sellar's Roman Poets of the Augustan Age, and Patin, Sur l'églogue latine (in *Rev. d. Deux Mondes*, 1838, 15: 234, 382). On medieval and modern idyls see the various histories of national poetry; the art. Idyl, Encyc. Brit., 11th ed.; and, especially, the references on pastoral poetry noted above, under Pastoral. See also R. T. Kerlin, Theocritus in English Lit. (Lynchburg, Virginia: 1910; Yale Thesis), which contains a long bibliography; H. M. Hall, Idylls of Fishermen, A Hist. of the Lit. Species (N.Y.: 1912; Columbia Diss.), with bibliography of its field; F. E. Schelling, A Book of 17th Cent. Lyrics (Boston: 1899); H. Broglé, as noted below, § 11; B. Wendell, The Temper of the 17th Cent. in English Lit. (N.Y.: 1904); D. Mornet, Le sentiment de la nature en France de J.-J. Rousseau à B. de St.-Pierre (Paris: 1907), L'idylle champêtre, p. 67 ff.; W. Nagel, Die deutsche Idylle im 18. Jahrh. (Diss., Zürich: 1887); G. Eskuche, Zur Geschichte der deutschen Idyllendichtung (Siegen: 1894); R. Maack, Pope's Einfluss auf die Idylle . . . in Deutschland (Hamb.: 1895); R. Knippel, Schillers Verhältnis zur Idylle (in *Breslauer Beiträge zur Littgesch.*, No. 18. 1909). R. Gosche's Idyll und Dorfgeschichte im Alterthum und Mittelalter (in *Arch. für Littgesch.*, 1870, 1: 169–227) is a brief, superficial survey of the characteristics of the idyllic literatures of the Hebrews, Egyptians, Hindoos, Chinese, Greeks, Romans, Germans, and Romance peoples. Compare G. Schneider's Ueber das Wesen und die Entwick. der Idylle (Hamburg: 1893).

SECTION 11. GENERAL REFERENCES

Most of the works on the historical development of this form of poetry are concerned with individual epics or the epics of particular nations. General works, discussing the history of the type as a whole, are necessarily rare; the study of epics separately is probably not so far advanced as to present a body of observation sufficiently broad, or sufficiently verified, for the task of general induction. In this list of references the few attempts at generalization that have been made are noted; but they have been supplemented by the more important studies of the various epics or particular national epic-literatures, especially when these special studies contain references or suggestions of a general nature. The student should also consult authorities, such as Gladstone, Kleinpaul, Lotze, Nettleship, Sellar, Ulrici, cited under §§ 8 and 9; and the Poetics of Scherer, Gottschall, Rosenkranz, Viehoff, etc., which may be traced by means of the Index. For histories of literature in general see the Appendix; here are noted only a few of the larger and more important of these.

ABERCROMBIE, L. The Epic.

See above, § 8.

AUBERTIN, C. Langue et littérature française au moyen âge. 2 vols. Paris: 1883.

Vol. I, pp. 222–380 Les sources de la poésie épique et héroïque au moyen âge; Cantilènes; Chansons de Geste; Épopées; les Cycles, etc.

AUBIGNAC, L'ABBÉ F. H. D'. Conjectures académiques ou dissertation sur l'Iliade. Paris: 1715.

Probably written as early as 1664. For this famous anticipation of the Wolfian theory of the multiple authorship of the Iliad, see § 9, VI, B, above.

BAZZONI, G. Di alcune epopee nazionali e del loro processo formativo. Milano: 1868.

Beatty, Arthur. Ballad, Tale, and Tradition: A Study in Popular Literary Origins. *Pubs. Mod. Lang. Ass.*, N.S. XXII, No. 4, pp. 473–498. Dec. 1914.

A brief outline of the argument that the story-content of the ballad derives not from communal dance and song but from the popular prose tale.

Bédier, J. Les légendes épiques. Recherches sur la formation des chansons de geste. 4 vols. Paris: 1908–13. 1st vol., 2d ed. 1913.

Reviews: *Romania*, 42: 593; *Littbl. f. germ. u. roman. Phil.*, No. 6. 1908; also P. Rajna in his Studi medievali (3: 331–391. 1910), and Bédier's reply, Réponse à M. Pio Rajna (Extrait des *Annales du Midi*, octobre 1910, Toulouse: 1910).

Authoritative and recent; of the highest philological and historical importance.

Biedermann, Freiherr W. von. Zur vergleichenden Geschichte der poetischen Formen.

See above, § 5.

Bistrom, W. Das russische Volksepos. In *Zeitschr. für Völkerpsychol. und Sprachwiss.*, 5: 180–205; 6: 132–162.

Descriptive of the metre, form, epithets, action, etc. A footnote (5: 180) gives a list of collections of Russian folk-epic songs. Another footnote (5: 181–182) gives a bibliography of some German works dealing with the Russian epic.

Blackwell, T. An Enquiry into the Life and Writings of Homer. 2d ed. Lond.: 1736.

This much-abused book, said to have suggested to Wolf his theory of epic composition, is at least of historical interest as being one of the earliest attempts in English to apply to epic criticism the sociological method. Blackwell's text is "that every kind of Writing, but especially the Poetic, depends upon the Manners of the Age when it is produced" (p. 70). Accordingly,

the social manners, religion, and language of the Homeric age are examined — unfortunately without critical distinction in weighing authorities — and Homer's superiority as an epic poet is explained by reference to peculiarly favorable conditions in his social and spiritual environment. In the course of the Enquiry many interesting discussions are started, such as the following: few surprising or marvellous things happen in a well-ordered state, and therefore such a state does not afford subjects for epic poetry (pp. 26–27); the epic poet cannot rely upon fictitious manners — he must describe what he has seen (29); "When . . . the Greek Language was brought to express all the best and bravest of the human Feelings and retained a sufficient Quantity of its Original, amazing, metaphoric Tincture; at that Point of Time did Homer write" (46–47); Homer appeared at a time when religion and belief had gained their vigor and had not lost the "Grace of Novelty and Youth" (51); a polished state of language is unsuitable to epic production (60); pernicious effect of an absolute court (61). For references to the bards (whence Wolf is said to have derived his idea), see pp. 79, 106 ff. Compare Herder and Wood, as noted in this section, and J. G. Hamann as noted in § 9, VIII, B. But all these men from Blackwell to Wolf had been anticipated by D'Aubignac (writing in 1664 and printing in 1715) and by Vico (printing in 1722). See § 9, VI, B, and V, C.

BLASS, F. Interpolationen in der Odyssee. Halle: 1904.

One of the later attempts at analysis of the Homeric texts. See review in *The Nation*, 81: 59.

BÖCKEL, O. Psychologie der Volksdichtung. Leipz.: 1906.

BOECKH, A. Encyklopädie und Methodologie der philologischen Wissenschaften. Leipz.: 1886.

Pp. 649–655 Greek epic; pp. 716–721 Latin epic; pp. 745–756 Bibliography.

BOISSIER, G. Les théories nouvelles du poème épique. In *Rev. d. Deux Mondes*, 67: 848–879. 1867.

Contains some superficial remarks upon the development of the epos from the popular chant or song, upon the Wolfian theory of epic composition, and upon the dangerous effect of these new theories of epic composition upon our critical appreciation of the artificial epic.

Broglé, H. Die französische Hirtendichtung in der 2. Hälfte des 18. Jahrhunderts dargestellt in ihrem besonderen Verhältniss zu Salom. Gessner. I. Idyll und Conte Champêtre. Diss. Leipz.: 1903.

For other works on pastoral and idyl see above, § 10, IX, B, C.

Bruchmann, K. Poetik.

Pp. 122–206. For this work see above, § 8.

Bruinier, J. W. Das deutsche Volkslied. 2d ed. Leipz.: 1904.

Brunetière, F. Études critiques sur l'histoire de la littérature française. Paris: 1880.

In the first essay Brunetière sounds what is possibly a much-needed warning against considering the *chanson de geste* as epic poetry. "Dans l'histoire de notre littérature, comme dans l'histoire de la littérature grecque et de la littérature latine, la chanson de geste est moins une poésie qu'un acheminement vers la prose, et non pas tant un genre capable de se suffire à soi-même qu'un apprentissage de la manière d'écrire l'histoire." — Compare Nouvelles questions de critique, p. 5.

Brunetière, F. Études critiques sur l'histoire de la littérature française. 5^e^ Série. Paris: 1893.

See the first essay: La Réforme de Malherbe et l'évolution des genres.

Brunetière, F. Nouvelles questions de critique. Paris: 1890.

See the first essay: La Poésie française au moyen âge.

Carrara, E. La poesia pastorale. Vol. V of the series, Storia dei generi letterari italiani. Milano: *c.* 1907.

Carriere, M. Die Poesie. Ihr Wesen und ihre Formen. 2d ed. Leipz.: 1884.

Pp. 173–190 Folk poetry *vs.* art poetry; pp. 227–280 Origin and development of the epic, — especially p. 228, the character of the heroic age from which the epic, with its objectivity, springs. 'Volksepos' rests upon the hero-saga. Regard the statement on p. 231 that the "Vermischung des Historischen und Idealen ist der Anfangspunkt der epischen Sage." Notice the discussion of Steinthal, and compare the author's theory of the development of the hero-saga from a lyric to an epic character with Professor Gummere's theory of ballad development (see below).

Chadwick, H. M. The Heroic Age. Cambridge: 1912.

This scholarly work is heartily recommended to the student who wishes by a comparative study of heroic poems and heroic ages to determine whether or not the folk epic is a recurring expression of a certain sort or stage of civilization. "The type of poetry known as heroic," says the author, "is one which makes its appearance in various nations and in various periods of history. No one can fail to observe that certain similar features are to be found in poems of this type which are widely separated from one another both in date and place of origin. In view of this fact it has seemed worth while to attempt a comparative study of two groups of such poems with the object of determining the nature of the resemblances between them and the causes to which they are due." The heroic poetry of the ancient Greeks and early Teutonic peoples is viewed under such aspects as the following: characteristics of the heroic ages of the two races, origin and distribution of epical stories and their relation to folk tales, relations of variants of the same story, minstrelsy of the heroic age, and estimates of the historical, supernatural, mythical, and fictitious elements in the poems. The author concludes that resemblances in the two groups of poems are due primarily "to resemblances in the ages to which they relate and to which they ultimately owe their origin. The comparative study of heroic poetry therefore involves the comparative study of 'Heroic Ages'; and the problems which it presents are essentially problems of anthropology."

CHILD, F. J. The English and Scottish Popular Ballads. 10 parts in 5 vols. Boston: 1882–1898.

Part X, Critical apparatus, ed. G. L. Kittredge.

This voluminous and authoritative work contains not only all the three hundred and five distinct English and Scottish popular ballads and, with several exceptions, all the versions of each, but also an exhaustive critical apparatus: an historical and bibliographical introduction to each ballad, with notes on distribution; collations, general bibliographies, index of published ballad airs, collection of tunes, etc. Indispensable in the critical and historical study of the ballad. Child's opinions on the ballad have been collected by W. M. Hart, *Pubs. Mod. Lang. Ass.*, 21: 755 ff. 1906. See also Child's article, Ballad Poetry, in Johnson's Cyclop., 1893.

CLARK, J. A History of Epic Poetry (Post-Vergilian). Edinburgh: 1900.

An ambitious, dogmatic, very sketchy and superficial discussion of the epic since Virgil.

CLAWSON, W. H. The Gest of Robin Hood. In *Univ. of Toronto Studies*, *Phil. Series*. 1909.

A study of the sources, proximate and probable, of the popular epic of Robin Hood, and of the manner of composition of such originals.

COMPARETTI, D. The Traditional Poetry of the Finns. (Translated by Miss I. M. Anderton from Il "Kalewala" o la poesia tradizionale dei Finni; studio storico-critico sulle origini delle grandi epopee nazionali.) N.Y.: 1899.

An extremely important work. Its problem is the discovery of the relationship in which the completed epic stands to the songs which preceded it (p. vii). The point of view is comparative. The Kalevala, which, as we have it, is a modern and fully authenticated combination of early anonymous songs, by one Lönnrot, "without inventions or additions on the part of the composer," is first analyzed, and the results are then applied to the composition-problems of other epics (ix). Comparetti shows at great length that Lönnrot has made up a so-called epic in exactly the fashion in which the Wolfians suppose the Greek epics to have been made; that an examination of Lönnrot's work in relation to the original Finnish songs shows that critical ingenuity, if ignorant of those songs, could not disengage them as the Wolfians profess to do with their made-up Homer: therefore the Wolfian hypothesis is untenable in general. Moreover, Lönnrot has not achieved, and could not possibly achieve by his Wolfian treatment of the original songs, the unity of the Greek epic: therefore the Wolfian theory is doubly untenable for the Homeric poems. The inference is individual inventive authorship. — In criticism it may be advanced that the refutation of the possibility of the Wolf-Lönnrot method of combination is not the refutation of all possible methods of combination. The student may well consult the review of Comparetti in *The Nation* (N. Y.), 69: 319.

DIPPOLD, G. T. The Great Epics of Mediaeval Germany. Boston: 1882.

DIXON, W. MACNEILE. English Epic and Heroic Poetry. Lond.: 1912.

While excellent as a history not of insignificant details but of the vital idea, poetic form, and fascination of the type, this is a genuine contribution in admirable literary style to constructive criticism as well. For appreciative reviews see *The Nation* (N. Y.), vol. 97, No. 2522, Oct. 30, 1913, and H. E. Cory, The English Epic, in *The Dial*, vol. 55, No. 651, Aug. 1, 1913.

Duchesne, J. Histoire des poëmes épiques français du XII^e siècle. Paris: 1870.

The *épopée* (Iliad and Odyssey, Roland, Nibelungenlied, etc.) is differentiated from the epic poem (Aeneid, Paradise Lost, Télémaque, etc.). The former is not a literary kind, but a literary epoch (p. 4). The conditions of success for the epic poem are then defined (summary, p. 20). The body of the work traces the history of epic poetry and epic theory from Ronsard to Fénelon. A convenient summary of the theoretical material contained in the prefaces to the various French epics of the seventeenth century — such as La Pucelle, Alaric, Clovis, Saint-Louis, Télémaque, etc. — will be found in pp. 57 ff. Much of the work is concerned with the propriety of Christian marvels — especially angels — in epic poems. An interesting account is given of Bossuet's share in arousing the attention of the epic poets to these marvels (Chap. XIII).

Egger, É. L'Hellénisme en France. 2 vols. Paris: 1869.

Vol. II, pp. 182–194 Development of French epic under Greek influence. Everything written by this distinguished and most critical scholar is worthy of careful consideration.

Elliott, F. Trustworthiness of the Border Ballads. 1906.

Elliott, F. Further Essays on Border Ballads. 1910.

Typical essays on the genuineness of certain Border Ballads.

Fairclough, H. R. The Connection between Music and Poetry in Early Greek Literature. In Studies in Honor of Basil L. Gildersleeve. 1902.

Fisher, L. A. Mystic Vision in the Grail Legend and in the Divine Comedy. N.Y.: 1917.

Literary influence of the doctrine of transubstantiation.

Fiske, A. K. The Great Epic of Israel. N.Y.: 1911.

Contains a popular account of the narrative literature of the Old Testament.

FOULET, LUCIEN. Le Roman de Renard. Paris: 1914.

Aiming to prove that the usual explanation of the derivation of the Renard from folklore, i.e., from the poetizing crowd and not from books, is incorrect, the author examines the archetype of the various manuscripts, dissociates the sixteen French branches of which it is composed and studies each in turn as an independent poem, arranges the chronology of each within the limits 1170–1205, shows by minute comparative investigation that the oldest branch is that which tells the stories of Renard and Chantecler, Renard and the tom-tit (mésange), Renard fooled by the cat (Tibert), and that the first and second of these stories derive from the Latin *épopée*, Ysengrimus, by Nivard (about 1150), but that the third is an invention of the *trouvère* himself. Not only is the Roman de Renard later than the Ysengrimus, but the German Reinhart Fuchs is later than still other branches of the Renard story — it is not a translation of French branches that have disappeared, but a clever recomposition of half a dozen branches still extant. Professor Foulet then traces the history of imitations, 1205–1250, and of animal folk-tales from that time down to Joel Chandler Harris' Uncle Remus, and shows conclusively, in our judgment, that these are not the product of folk composition and oral tradition, but that they derived directly or indirectly from the Roman de Renard and other books. The Roman de Renard, in fine, "is the work not of the crowd, but of a score of clerks of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, who borrowed from ancient or mediaeval Latin the framework, the form of their compositions; the material, however, they owed only to themselves and to their epoch." This study is a model of literary historical investigation — one of the most conclusive rebuttals of the folk-inditing theory of Grimm, Sudre, Voretzsch, and its modified presentation by Gaston Paris, — of value as applicable not only to the composition of this particular epopee but to the whole Wolf-Lachmann hypothesis, and to still later attempts at the derivation of poetry from the afflatus of the dancing, singing crowd.

A few of the more important studies of the Renard literature, as cited by Foulet, are Ernst Martin, Observations sur le Roman de Renard (Strassb.-Paris: 1887) — his edition of 1882–85 is mentioned below, § 12, V, E; L. Sudre, Les Sources du Roman de Renart (Paris: 1892), and the review by G. Paris in the *Journal des Savants*, Sept.–Dec., 1894, Feb. 1895 (reprinted in Mélanges de lit. franç. du moyen âge, publ. by Mario Roques, Paris: 1912); Paulin Paris, Les Aventures de maître Renard et d'Ysengrin son compère (Paris: 1861); Jacob Grimm, Reinhart Fuchs (Berlin: 1834); by the same, Sendschreiben an Karl Lachmann, Ueber Reinhart Fuchs (Leipz.: 1840); H. Bütnner, Die Ueberlieferung des Roman de Renard und die Handschrift O (Strassburg: 1891); Jonckblaet, Étude sur le Roman de Renart (Groningue: 1863); Mone, Reinardus Vulpes (Stuttg. et Tubing.: 1832); Voigt, ed. of Ysengrimus (Halle: 1884); Reissenberger, ed. of Reinhart Fuchs (Halle: 1886); Rothe, Les Romans de R. examinés, etc. (Paris: 1845); Voretzsch, Tierfabel, Tiermärchen u. Tierepos (in relation to the R. de R., Reutlingen: 1905); Gerber, Uncle Remus traced to the Old World (in *Journ. Am. Folk-Lore*, VI, p. 245); Warren, on Uncle Remus and Renard (in *Mod. Lang. Notes*, V, 258).

Of works on the animal epic and folklore, in general, the following are cited by Foulet: Kolmatchevsky, L'épopée animale en Occident et chez les Slaves (Paris: 1882), and the review by Gerber (in *Pubs. Mod. Lang. Assoc. of America*, VI, p. 6, 1891); C. Voretzsch, Jacob Grimm's Deutsche Thiersage und die moderne Forschung (in *Preuss. Jahrb.*, LXXX, p. 417, 1895), and the reviews by Sudre (in *Ltbl. f. germ. u. rom. Phil.*, 1895, col. 15 ff.) and Willems, Ysengrimus (in *Ztschr. f. rom. Phil.*, XX, p. 413, 1896); Cahier et Martin, Le Bestiaire de Pierre le Picard (in Mélanges d'archéologie, etc., Paris: 1851); Voigt, Kleinere lateinische Denkmäler der Tiersage (1878); Robert, Fables inédites des XII^e^, XIII^e^, et XIV^e^ siècles et Fables de La Fontaine (2 vols., Paris: 1825); Novati, Quelques remarques sur un très ancien document de la fable animale en France, *Moyen Age*, 1892, p. 178; Hervieux, Les fabulistes latins (Paris: 1896); Bédier, Les Fabliaux (Paris: 1895); Jacobs, The Folk (in *Folk-Lore*, IV, p. 232); Cerquand, Légendes et récits populaires du pays basque (Pau: 1882). See also M. E. Smith, The Fable and Kindred Forms (in *Jr. Eng. and Germ. Phil.*, 14: 519. 1915); M. Plessow, Gesch. der Fabeldichtung in England bis zu John Gay, 1726 (in *Palaestra*, No. 52. 1906), with text of four 16th-century English fable-books; F. Tyroller, Die Fabel von dem Mann und dem Vogel in ihrer Verbreitung in der Weltlit. (in *Litthist. Forsch.*, No. 51); Voigt in Nos. 8, 25 of *Quellen und Forsch.*

Francke, K. Social Forces in German Literature. N.Y.: 1896.

The remarks upon the progress of the collectivistic and individualistic tendencies in the development of the German epic are particularly stimulating.

Frick, O., and Polack, F. Aus deutschen Lesebüchern. Bd. IV Epische und lyrische Dichtungen erläutert für die Oberklassen der höheren Schulen und für das deutsche Haus. Erste Abt., Epische Dichtungen. Zweite Aufl. Gera u. Leipz.: 1894.

An excellent compendium of fact and description for one beginning his acquaintance with German epic poetry. Chapters on the Nibelungenlied, Gudrun, Parzival, Der arme Heinrich, Das glückhafte Schiff von Zürich, Der Messias, Der Heliand, Hermann und Dorothea, Reineke Fuchs.

Gautier, L. Les épopées françaises. 5 vols. in 6. 2d ed. Paris: 1878–97.

> Vol. I Étude sur les origines et l'histoire de la littérature nationale. Pp. 3–6 Trois genres de poésie; la poésie épique est postérieure à la lyrique; elle précède les temps où l'on écrit l'histoire; pp. 6–13 Deux espèces d'épopées; des conditions nécessaires; p. 13 ff. L'épopée française.

An admirable, useful, and most scholarly work, which shows that the early epic poets of France did not string together the *chansons de geste* from popular songs, but were merely inspired by these pre-existent *cantilènes*. For a critique of the first edition, vol. I (1865), in which Gautier had espoused the *Lieder-Theorie* as explaining the formation of the *chansons de geste*, see P. Meyer, Recherches sur l'épopée française (Paris: 1867).

Gayley, C. M. The Principles of Poetry. N.Y.: 1904.

In English Poetry, its Principles and Progress by C. M. Gayley and C. C. Young. See above, §§ 2, 8. P. xciv Distinction between the great, or folk, epic, and the individual epic.

Gayley, C. M. Classic Myths in English Literature and in Art. Boston: 1911.

See Chaps. XXX–XXXII The Origin and Elements of Myth; The Distribution of Myths; The Preservation of Myths: Greek, Roman, Norse, German, Egyptian, Indian, Persian.

Gerould, G. H. Saints' Legends. Boston: 1916.

After a preliminary discussion of the definition and use, origins and propagation of saints' legends, the story of their development in English literature is told with scholarly enthusiasm. The bibliographical appendix affords convenient and valuable direction.

Gervinus, G. G. Geschichte der poetischen National-Literatur der Deutschen. 3d ed. 2 vols. Leipz.: 1846.

Th. I, pp. 176–191 French folk epic. Th. II, pp. 93–111 German national epic; compare Th. I, pp. 306 ff.

Girard, J. Études sur la poésie grecque. 2d ed. Paris: 1900. Chap. IV La pastorale dans Théocrite.

Görbing, F. Beispiele von realisierten Mythen in der englischen und schottischen Balladen. In *Anglia*, 23: 1. 1901.

Gosse, E. Epic Poetry. In Encyc. Brit., 11th ed.

A very brief *résumé* of the history of epic poetry; but illuminating, as all Mr. Gosse's work is.

Gosse, E. Pastoral. In Encyc. Brit., 11th ed. A brief historical sketch.

See also the same author's English Pastoral Poetry, and Grosart's Rider on Mr. G.'s Essay, in Grosart's ed. of Spenser, 3: ix–lxxi. 1882.

Grandgent, C. H. Dante (Master Spirits of Literature Series). N.Y.: 1916.

Dante is depicted as the representative of the Middle Ages, and the Divine Comedy as the true and abiding expression of all phases of the medieval spirit. It is a vision, a fantastic journey, a spiritual

autobiography in one. The chapters on society and politics, church and state, medieval learning and theology, and the medieval temper furnish a vivid background against which medieval song, allegory, epic and romance, and the Divine Comedy stand in clear relief. Not only is the book the best introduction in English to the study of Dante, it is also so well equipped with bibliography of translations, editions, and references that the student may acquaint himself readily with the results of Dante scholarship. And the style of the writer is charming and rich.

Greg, W. W. Pastoral Poetry and Pastoral Drama.

For a notice of this important work see above, § 8.

Gröber, G. Grundriss der romanischen Philologie. 2 Bde. Strassburg: 1888–1902.

Consult for bibliography of various romance literatures, — France, Italy, Spain, etc. For further references, see below, § 12.

Grosse, E. The Beginnings of Art. N.Y.: 1897.

Pp. 250–265; cf. above, § 5.

The author excludes from primitive epic material all aetiological stories and (surprisingly enough) historical traditions, and confines his attention to a few animal and other stories which are noticeably similar to our fairy tales. Such stories are narrative, hardly epical, in nature and substance. Is not epic material more nearly allied to historic traditions? See Panzer, Märchen, Sage und Dichtung (cited below).

Grote, G. History of Greece. 12 vols. 1st ed. Lond.: 1848.

Part I, Chap. XXI (vol. II, p. 160).

Though this chapter contains almost nothing in the way of general epic theory, being taken up almost entirely with a criticism of the Wolfian hypothesis, it remains even at the present day one of the best introductions to the study of the Homeric poems. The distinction between bards and rhapsodes should be considered. In opposition to Wolf, Grote believes that the Iliad and Odyssey were entire poems long anterior to Pisistratus, whether they were originally composed as wholes or not. The notably unified structure of the Odyssey precludes the probability of its having been pieced together out of preceding epics. The analogy of the Odyssey shows that long and premeditated epical composition is consistent with the capacities of the early Greek mind. The Iliad as a whole is much less coherent than the Odyssey; but those parts of it that make up the story of the wrath of Achilles show a well-organized poem. This poem — the Achilleis, or the Achilleid, as it is sometimes called — was the original poem, the scheme of which did not comprehend the entire Iliad as we now have it. To the story of the wrath of Achilles were added other stories dealing with other aspects of the war around Ilium; hence the title, Iliad. The original Achilleis, Grote thinks, was made up of Books I, VIII, and XI to XXII. The transition from the Achilleis to the Iliad is found in the beginning of the second book; the transition back to the Achilleis occurs at the end of the seventh book. The Odyssey, Grote believes, is by one author; the Iliad probably not. For further notice of the Homeric question, see below, § 12, I, A. For a development of Grote's theory of an Achilleid, see W. D. Geddes, The Problem of the Homeric Poems (Lond.: 1878).

GUBERNATIS, A. DE.

See above, § 5. See volume entitled Storia della poesia epica.

GUMMERE, F. B. The Beginnings of Poetry. N.Y.: 1901.

See Chap. V for the relations of ballad and choral refrain, and pp. 422–424 for the development therefrom of the epic. The author speaks of that "state of things where, as Ten Brink has put it so well, song oscillates between production and reproduction, that is, between improvisation and memory. This is the period of the early epic. When deliberation and conscious art come in, and yet the old alliance of spontaneous production and living memory is not broken up, then is the golden age of epic verse; then Homer, whoever or whatever he may be, can work out the perfect union of art and nature" (p. 424). See also p. 434 ff., on myth and its relation to religion and poetry. For the earliest differentiations of poetry — Lyric, Drama, and Epic — see Chap. VII.

GUMMERE, F. B. The Popular Ballad. Boston: 1907.

An indispensable work on the popular origin, classification, characteristics, sources, and poetic worth of the popular ballad in English and Scottish literature. The author is the chief supporter of the communal theory of ballad origins. See also his other works: Old English Ballads, Introduction, which contains an outline of ballad criticism (Boston: 1894); The Ballad and Communal Poetry, in Child Memorial Volume of Studies and Notes in Philol. and Lit. (Boston: 1896); Primitive Poetry and the Ballad, 3 papers, in *Modern Philology*, 1: 193–202, 217–234, 373–390. 1903–04; Art. Ballad, in Camb. Hist. Eng. Lit., vol. II. 1908. For views opposed to the theory of popular origins see T. F. Henderson as noted below, and his Scottish Vernacular Lit., p. 355 ff. (1898), and Introd. to new ed. of Scott's Minstrelsy (1902); W. J. Courthope, Hist. of Eng. Poetry, 1: 426 ff. (1895); G. G. Smith, The Transition Period, p. 180 ff. (1900).

GUNKEL, H. Genesis. In Handkommentar zum Alten Testament. Ed. by W. Nowack. Göttingen: 1901.

The Einleitung has been translated by W. H. Carruth, The Legends of Genesis (Chicago: 1901).

The Old Testament affords the student of the development of literary types a field of almost unequalled opportunity. The primitive origin of many of the stories, the long stages of development through which they have passed, the preservation in their present form of traces of their previous history, their relation to the literature of other peoples, especially the Babylonians; the ascertainable conditions under which later stories (such as those in Judges, Kings, Samuel, etc.) arose, and the characteristic political and religious influences to which they were subjected in successive ages; the clearly marked periods of oral tradition, oral cycles, written cycles, and the like; the problem of the absence of a Hebrew epic, — all contribute to the richness of this field. The specialists in Hebrew philology and archaeology have tilled the field extensively; the student of comparative literature will find it ready to his reaping. Of all the volumes of the specialists, Gunkel's Genesis is the most suggestive to the literary student. In the Introduction, and throughout the Commentary, Gunkel clearly marks the literary stages, from primitive or barbaric originals, through which the stories of Genesis may have progressed; he relates these stages to their social, political, and religious backgrounds, and differentiates their literary technique. He is indefatigable in indicating the traces of origin and development still retained by the stories.

Hallam, H. Introduction to the Literature of Europe. 7th ed. 4 vols. Lond.: 1864.

Hanford, J. H. Classical Eclogue and Medieval Debate. In *Romanic Rev.*, 2: 16, 129. 1911.

On the origin of the medieval *débat*.

Hanford, J. H. The Pastoral Elegy and Milton's Lycidas. In *Mod. Lang. Ass. Pubs.*, 25: 403–447. 1910.

Hapgood, I. F. Epic Songs of Russia. Introd. Note by F. J. Child. N.Y.: 1886.

On the Russian epic, see below, § 12, xvi.

Beside describing in brief outline the Russian folk epos, the Introduction furnishes many valuable data and suggestions for the comparative study of the epic. Agricultural occupation is not favorable to the preservation of epic song, and in such a society the singers come almost entirely from the ranks of "tailors, shoemakers and net-makers" (p. 6); singers and hearers alike believe implicitly in the marvels of the songs, and when doubt enters, epic poetry dies (7); the introduction of schools and of trade results in the destruction of popular epic poetry (9); stages of decay in an epic poem (11); relation of the Russian cycles to Aryan originals (11 ff.).

HART, W. M. Ballad and Epic. A Study in the Development of Narrative Art. In *Studies and Notes in Philol. and Lit.*, vol. XI (Harvard University). Boston: 1907.

A storehouse of materials carefully observed and systematized with a view to an inductive study of literary evolution. The author traces stages of development, in certain definite essentials (length, scope of subject, motivation, elaboration of character and structure, etc.), through the various types of the ballad to the epic. This development from ballad to epic proceeds mainly by a process of elaboration (or growth from within), and another process of accretion (or growth by the aggregation of independent incidents). The following general tendencies of elaboration are discovered: (1) increase in scope, — "the simplicity and meagreness of the Simple Ballad, the steady increase through Border and Outlaw Ballads to the *Gest* and Heroic Ballads, the enormous increase in the Epic"; and accompanying this "a gradual advance, again with a break and leap to the Epic at the end, from the almost complete absence of detail in the Simple Ballad to the wealth of material . . . in the Epic"; (2) the poet, in the course of this procedure, impresses himself with growing emphasis upon his material, thinking of it "more and more as a body of related phenomena"; (3) an increasing abstraction, particularly by an inference of character, mental states, and motives, from the action presented; by the conception of action as conduct; and by the development of an interest in manners out of the more primitive insistence upon rank; (4) elaboration of plot, dialogue, character; (5) increase in length due to combination of stories and, consequently, an increase in general architectonic power; (6) an increasing delight in the art of telling the story, as distinct from the interest in the story itself. — At the close of the book the author, in the light of his detailed studies, makes a valuable suggestion in connection with the *Lieder-Theorie*: that there is indeed a certain similarity in kind between ballad and epic, but that there is at the same time "an enormous difference in degree, in stage of development"; and that if the epic is "made up of a series of heroic songs, strung together with little or no modification, these songs must have been something very different from the popular ballad; they must have been highly developed examples of the poetry of art." — For its method, as well as for its results, the book is very valuable to the literary student; and it should encourage the displacement of a too commonly loose and *a priori* critical method by a sane, exact, and strictly inductive one. For a review see W. H. Clawson, Ballad and Epic (in *Journ. of American Folk-Lore*, 21 : 349–361).

HART, W. M. English Popular Ballads. Chicago: 1916.

The Introduction (pp. 11–51) is a brief but admirable account of the ballad, — at once sympathetic and scholarly. An attempt has been made here "to trace the development of the narrative art from the simple ballad of situation to the popular epic of Robin Hood, from the manner of the ballad *par excellence*, the ballad of the multitude, to the manner of a rudimentary poetry of art, the poetry of the individual poet. Typical ballads are analyzed, and, incidentally, compared with the poetry of art. An attempt is made, finally, to interpret the results in the light of Professor Gummere's theory of communal origins."

HEGEL, G. W. F.

Op. cit., § 8. Bd. X, Abt. III, pp. 396–418.

Hegel's theory of the development of epic poetry, in spite of the philosophical prepossession of the author and his primarily deductive method, is of prime importance. He considers the oriental epos, the classical epos of the Greeks, and the epic-romantic epos of Christendom. Naturally the epic of the classical stage is for Hegel the highest development of its kind. Note the influence of Teutonic paganism and of medieval knight-errantry upon this type of poetry.

HENDERSON, T. F. The Ballad in Literature. Cambridge: 1912.

In pp. 57–96 Origin and Authorship, the writer attempts to confute and with some degree of success the dictum of Child, that the historical and natural place of the ballad is anterior to the appearance of the poetry of art, and the theories developed by Gummere, Kittredge, and Hart of its origin as an improvisation, either in the presence of, or mainly by, a throng (according to Gummere, a dancing throng). Mr. Henderson falls foul of the theory also of oral transmission and improvement in the process. He favors the conclusions of Jeanroy and Gaston Paris: that the authorship is of individual poets of a certain culture but *en rapport* with the thought and sentiment of the people; that the oldest surviving ballads of every country are of later date than the old epic verse; that the lyric-epic in general "did not originate among what is usually termed the folk."

HERDER, J. G. Sämmtliche Werke. Ed. by B. Suphan. 32 vols. Berlin: 1877–99.

Taken in their chronological order the chief writings which concern the student of the history of literature are as follows: Fragmente über die neuere deutsche Lit. (1767), Kritische Wälder (1769), Über Ossian und die Lieder alter Völker (1773), Von Ähnlichkeit der mittleren englischen und deutschen Dichtkunst (1777), Stimmen der Völker in Liedern (1778–79), Wirkung der Dichtkunst auf die Sitten der Völker (1778), Vom Geist der hebräischen Poesie (1782–83), Ideen zur Philosophie der Geschichte der Menschheit (1784), Briefen zur Beförderung der Humanität (1794), Über Homer und Ossian (1795). See also above, § 8, under Herder. On Herder see C. Joret, Herder et la renaissance littéraire en Allemagne au XVIII^e^ siècle (1875); R. Haym, Herder nach seinem Leben und seinen Werken (2 vols. 1880–85); R. Bürkner, Herder, sein Leben und Wirken (1904); H. Nevinson, A Sketch of Herder and his Times (1884).

Herder may be said to be the father of the modern historical or genetic method of conceiving and studying national culture, including, specifically, national poetry. The study of early folk or 'primitive' poetry derives from him. From him we inherit the theory of the primitive origin and development of poetry under determining conditions of environment, and of the growth of distinctive national traits. He saw the field of poetry as a natural whole, springing from uniquely human conditions, developing diversely in different environments, splendidly divided among the nations of men. From this broad, evolutionary conception he derived much of the fine enthusiasm, and even inspiration, that color his intensely suggestive but unsystematic essays upon poetry.

The student should thoroughly acquaint himself with Herder's seminal ideas. As a guide to reading, the following topics may be suggested: (1) English influences upon Herder, — Addison and Pope (see above, §§ 8, 9), Blackwell and Wood (see above and below), Percy's Reliques, Ossian, Shakespeare, etc.; (2) Revolt from neo-classicism, which is unhistorical in its application of absolute standards of criticism (derived from antiquity) to all nations in all stages of their growth; Herder as a leader in the new Sturm und Drang movement, — a pioneer of romanticism; (3) National idiosyncrasy in poetry as illustrated by Homer for the Greeks, by 'Ossian' for the Northern peoples, and by Hebrew poetry; (4) Homer as a folk poet, not composing according to the rules of Aristotle, but handing down in living oral form impromptu rhapsodies commemorative of what he had seen and heard; (5) Relation of ballad and folk song to epic composition; (6) Lyrical quality of early folk narratives; (7) Coincidence between the stages of belief in divine agency and stages in the evolution of the epic; also a connection between the appearance of history in Greece and the disappearance of the epic (see reference above, § 8); (8) Other suggestions — usually vague, seldom amplified — of laws of poetic development; (9) Effect of Herder's ideas: (*a*) the new significance of the study of poetry in the light of the poet's environment: as, for example, the significance of the Homeric poems when seen not under the formalism and historical ignorance of neo-classical legislation, but as the ideal revelation of a particular period of human development, — a period that is represented in the very style and construction of the epics as well as in their events and characters, human and divine; (*b*) the new significance of myth, marvel, superstition, and fairy-story when studied as natural expressions of certain ages or conditions of culture; (*c*) the new evolutionary conception of poetry, particularly of the epic (though still of that Rousseau order that sentimentalized the primitive at the expense of later progress).

HERFORD, C. H. Spenser. Shepheard's Calendar. Lond.: 1897.

See Introduction for a scholarly and most stimulating account of pastoral poetry in general. On the relation of Spenser's Calendar to earlier pastoral poetry see F. Kluge and O. Reissert in *Anglia*, 3: 266; 9: 205.

HÉRICAULT, CHARLES D'. Essai sur l'origine de l'épopée française, et sur son histoire au moyen âge. Paris: 1859.

One of the earliest of general works upon the origin of the French *épopée* (cf. Fauriel). D'Héricault examines the Cantilènes in honour of the Carlovingian kings, discusses characteristics of thought and language, and shows by what influences of race-element and of history they were developed into the Chansons de Geste. He then recounts the influences, poetic, political, and 'cyclical,' under which the Chanson passed, and follows particularly the history of the Arthurian Cycle. He shows how the romance of adventure and of love disengaged itself from the Arthurian Cycle, dropped from poetry to prose, from the dignified to the popular, and found its final resting-place in the Bibliothèque Bleue.

HERMANN, GOTTFRIED. Dissertatio de Interpolationibus Homeri. Leipz.: 1832. — De Iteratis Homeri. Leipz.: 1840. Reprinted in his Opuscula.

A very important follower of Wolf, who, however, in view of Nitzsch's powerful arguments in opposition to the *Lieder-Theorie*, modified the Wolfian thesis by admitting the existence of an Iliad core dealing with the Wrath of Achilles, and an Odyssey core dealing with the Return. According to Hermann there are in the Iliad pre-Homeric lays, an Homeric core, and later interpolations.

HEUSLER, A. Lied und Epos in germanischer Sagendichtung. Dortmund: 1905.

Dr. Heusler follows Ker (Epic and Romance, 1897, pp. 92 ff., 105 ff., 140 ff.) in maintaining that the fundamental difference between the epos and older popular songs lies in the art of narrative and not in the mere gluing together of the songs to form a bigger poem. "Der Weg vom Liede zum Epos ist Anschwellung; Verbreiterung des Stiles." "Auf der einen Seite ein gedrungener, andeutender, springender Stil; die 'liedhafte Knappheit.' Auf der andern Seite ein gemächlicher, verweilender, ausmalender Stil; die 'epische Breite'" (pp. 24, 22).

HIRN, YRJÖ. The Origins of Art.

See above, § 8.

HOSKINS, J. P. Biological Analogy in Literary Criticism.

See above, § 5.

HUGO, VICTOR. Théatre. Paris (Lib. Hachette): 1882.

Vol. I, Théâtre, Preface to Cromwell, pp. 26–31.

A somewhat extravagant but eloquent assertion of the priority of lyric to epic. The following dictum is worthy of discussion: "L'ode, l'épopée, le drama," — such are the ages of poetry. "La Bible avant l'Iliade, l'Iliade avant Shakespeare. . . . La société en effet commence par chanter ce qu'elle rêve, puis raconte ce qu'elle fait, et enfin se met à peindre ce qu'elle pense. . . . Les modernes n'ont pas la tête épique." Also Hugo's statement that Paradise Lost and the Divine Comedy were dramatic rather than epic. Were the conditions of their composition dramatic? E. Rigal, in his Victor Hugo. Poète épique (Paris: 1900), attempts to show that Hugo himself evinced a *tête épique* in his La Légende des siècles; compare E. Dupuy, Victor Hugo (new ed. Paris: 1890).

HURGRONJE, C. S. The Achehnese. Trans. by A. W. S. O'Sullivan. 2 vols. Leyden and Lond.: 1906.

Contains a valuable account of the rise of oral narrative poetry.

IMMISCH, O. Die innere Entwicklung des griechischen Epos. Ein Baustein zu einer historischen Poetik. Leipz.: 1904.

An attempt to show that the inner development of the Greek epic involved, in part, the treatment of old, communal mythic materials in a larger, individualistic spirit, as seen here and there in details of artistic form, realistic portrayal, romantic sentimentalism, etc.

JACOBOWSKI, L. Die Anfänge der Poesie. Grundlegung zu einer realistischen Entwickelungsgeschichte der Poesie. Dresden: 1891.

"Urpoesie ist Urlyrik," says the author, with which assertion compare Wackernagel's equally dogmatic "Alle Poesie ist zuerst episch gewesen." Jacobowski's essay is an immature but very clever reduction of poetry to its elements: exclamation points, interjections, the sense of hearing and seeing, the impulses of love and nursing, the call of the first man to the first woman, the wail of the first baby in the ears of the first mother. The author has applied to literary investigation a few of the results of biological, anthropological, and psychological science.

JACOBOWSKI, L. Primitive Erzählungskunst. In *Die Gesellschaft*, 15^8: 9–21. (Rev. in *Jahresb. für neuere deutsche Litteraturgesch.*, vol. XI, I, 3: 263 (1900).)

Describes what the author believes to be the earliest stage of narrative art found among primitive savages.

JACOBS, J. The Most Delectable History of Reynard the Fox. Lond.: 1895.

The introduction contains a popular summary of the results of researches by Grimm, Voigt, Martin, and Sudre into the antecedents and character of this so-called 'beast-epic.' Compare other works on the fable by the same author; see Foulet, above.

JEBB, R. C. Homer: An Introduction to the Iliad and the Odyssey. 2d ed. Glasgow: 1887. 6th ed. Boston: 1904.

Chap. I, pp. 1–37 (2d ed.).

The student will find here no slight assistance toward the comparative study of lyric, ballad, and epic. The author discusses in order of development the pre-Homeric poems (songs of the seasons, songs of legendary bards belonging to the Thracian, Southern, and Asiatic groups); the Homeric epic, its characteristics and its relation to ballad poetry and to the literary epic (Aeneid, Paradise Lost). On the blending of divine and human agencies see p. 26; on the importance and the fashion of similes in the epic, and on freshness, nobility, rapidity, and simplicity in style, pp. 28–36. Jebb concedes the superior antiquity of hymn and song, but deems the lyric proper of more recent birth than the epic. Is such a position tenable? See also the chapter on Literature, by Jebb, in L. Whibley's A Companion to Greek Studies (Cambridge: 1905), which contains a convenient *résumé* of Homeric criticism.

JEBB, R. C. The Growth and Influence of Classical Greek Poetry. Boston: 1893.

Chaps. I–III.

A clear arrangement of material on the origin and development of the Greek epic, and its relation to the genius of the Greek race, to legend, minstrelsy, and the lyric.

JENSEN, P. Das Gilgamesch-Epos in der Weltliteratur. Strassburg: 1906.

Bd. I Die Ursprünge der alttestamentlichen Patriarchen-, Propheten- und Befreier-Sage und der neutestamentlichen Jesus-Sage.

At great length the author traces the Gilgamesh story through its variants.

JUSSERAND, J. J. L'Épopée mystique de W. Langland. Paris: 1893.

KEIDEL, G. C. Romance and Other Studies. Baltimore: 1896.

No. II A Manual of Aesopic Fable Literature.

A useful volume of first reference for those desiring to begin the study of the fable. Supplies bibliography. See Foulet, above.

Ker, W. P. Danish Ballads. In *Scottish Hist. Rev.*, July 1904, July 1908.

Ker, W. P. Epic and Romance. Lond.: 1897.

For a summary of this, the most considerable of English contributions to the study of the epic, see under § 8. The whole work is valuable for theory, for descriptive material, and for historical method; but the following sections in the first two chapters should be noted especially: Chap. I, §§ 1, 3, 4; Chap. II, §§ 2, 3, 5, 6. As proceeding from a master of the subject, the conclusions of Professor Ker concerning the composite or agglutinative theory of composition (Chap. II, §§ 2, 5) are of great weight.

Ker, W. P. On the History of the Ballads 1100–1500. In *Proc. of the Brit. Acad.*, vol. IV. Read Dec. 15, 1909.

A valuable comparative study.

Kittredge, G. L. Introduction to Sargent and Kittredge's Student's ed. of Child's English and Scottish Popular Ballads. Boston: 1904.

The introduction affords the best brief survey and judicial appraisal of the conflicting theories of ballad origin.

Klenze, C. von. The Sigfrid Stories, etc. In *Poet-lore*, 10: 543 ff. Boston: 1898.

In part, a simple attempt to trace the development of the Siegfried story from its beginnings in the personification of natural phenomena to its amalgamation with legend and history. The notice is very meager and popular, but it suggests a method of inquiry often pushed much further and of absorbing interest. For more detailed studies of the same kind see the references given below, under the Nibelungenlied (§ 12, xi, c).

Körting, G. Encyclopaedie und Methodologie der romanischen Philologie. 3 vols. Heilbronn: 1884–88.

See the third volume for bibliographies of the romance literatures.

KROHN, J. Die Entstehung der einheitlichen Epen im allgemeinen. In *Zeitschr. f. Völkerpsychol. u. Sprachwiss.*, 18: 59–68.

Using his observations of the Kalevala as a basis, the author criticizes some of the conclusions of Steinthal's essay upon the epic (see below). Contrary to Steinthal's theory, the Kalevala would seem to show that the simplest embryos of the epic are short songs (*kleine Lieder*). These songs grow by the addition of fragments, sometimes whole episodes, from other songs known to the minstrel, — more rarely by additions of the minstrel's own. Again, the short song may develop by being combined with another short song. The further evolution of these songs is due, principally, to three causes: (1) additions and omissions resulting from the reciter's mistakes in memory; (2) the assimilative tendency by which the story of a popular hero tends to transfer to itself and its hero stories told about other heroes of less renown; (3) the tendency to prolong the effect of a successful theme by using the same theme again with variations of setting. The cause of the development of a unified epic is said to lie in the presence, among the mass of song material, of some one song that is significant enough to satisfy better than any other the imaginative cravings of the people. Like a whirlpool, this particular song attracts to itself everything in its vicinity. It becomes a center of assimilation for other songs. The first impulse to epic poetry is found in the popular excitement following upon a great national or historical event. Finally, the conglomeration of songs must pass under the unifying hand of a poet who can at one and the same time preserve the characteristics of the folk poetry and give to it a well-rounded, harmonious unity. — The conclusions of this essay should be checked by a comparison with Comparetti's Trad. Poetry of the Finns (see above). Cf. Hart and Heusler.

KURTZ, B. P. Studies in the Marvellous. Lond.: 1910. Also in *Univ. of Calif. Pubs. Mod. Philol.*, vol. I.

Chap. I Greek Criticism of Fiction and Marvel; Chap. II The Psychology of Wonder; Chap. III Wonder in Primitive Mind, Custom, and Belief; Chap. IV Wonder in Central Australian Belief and Story.

LACHMANN, K. Betrachtungen über Homers Ilias. 3d ed. Berlin: 1874.

In 1816 Lachmann began to apply the method of Wolf (see below, under Wolf) to the Nibelungenlied (see below, § 12, XI, C). In dealing with the Iliad he went far beyond Wolf in an attempt to prove the composite nature of the text. Wolf had distinctly said (in the Preface to his edition of the Iliad, Halle: 1794) that the sutures, formed by the stitching together of separate lays to form the present text, probably could never be discovered; but Lachmann, disregarding Wolf's conservative warning, attempted to prove that "the Iliad was made up of a number of originally independent lays, skilfully united, but still showing to a careful observer the seams of juncture." This is the celebrated *Kleine Lieder* theory, now generally abandoned.

LANG, A. Homer and the Epic. Lond.: 1893.

Lang considers the moot question of the unity of the Homeric poems, and maintains that "the Homeric epics, in spite of certain flaws, and breaks, and probable insertion of alien matter, are mainly the work of one, or, at the most, of two, great poets" (p. 10). Chap. II contains a convenient *résumé* of Homeric criticism before Wolf, and Chap. III summarizes the Wolfian thesis. Chaps. XVI–XVIII contain a comparative treatment of the Homeric epics, the Nibelungenlied, the Roland, and the Kalevala, from the point of view of their historical composition. — Compare, by the same author, an article on The Song of Roland and the Iliad (in the *Nat. Rev.*, Oct. 1892); and his Introduction to Comparetti — in support of the comparative against the analytic, or Wolfian, way of studying the epic.

LANG, A. Homer and his Age. Lond.: 1906.

Lang again attacks the composite theory, this time with an argument drawn from archaeology. He argues that the Homeric poems are a product of a single age, not a "mosaic of several changing centuries," by endeavoring to show that the poems depict the life of a single brief age of culture, with no anachronisms. Poets like Virgil, who write of early times in later, uncritical ages, are full of anachronisms: they do not archaize. The absence of anachronisms in Homer tends, therefore, to disprove later composition. — But is Lang's answer to Helbig (who claimed that such archaeological unity might be due to the "sedulous copying of poetic tradition") satisfactory? Chaps. XV, XVI treat the problem comparatively.

Lang, A. The World of Homer. Lond.: 1910.

Should be read with Lang's two other works on Homer. For a brief statement of the author's conclusions about the Homeric Question see Chap. XX.

Lang, A. Art. Ballads, Encyc. Brit. 11th ed.

"The object of this article is to prove that what has long been acknowledged of nursery tales, of what the Germans call *Märchen*, namely, that they are the immemorial inheritance at least of all European peoples, is true also of some ballads." See the same author's article Ballad in Chambers' Cylop. of Eng. Lit., 1902.

Laveleye, E. de. La Saga des Nibelungen dans les Eddas et dans le Nord scandinave. Traduction précédée d'une étude sur la formation des épopées nationales. Paris: 1866.

The introduction first lays down a general theory of the epic, and then illustrates it by reference to the Nibelungenlied. The origin of the epic is found in both history and myth: the heroic element is a development of the former; the marvellous element is contributed by the latter. The epic material exists first in the form of popular songs; later these are dominated by one idea, e.g. by the idea of Fate, and then go through a process of coalescence, and division into parts of a whole. The epic material is then ready for the hand of the great artist, who is to give to it its final form.

LAWTON, W. C. The Successors of Homer. N.Y.: 1898.

LEAF, W. Companion to the Iliad. Lond.: 1892.

Dr. Leaf is a separatist of the school of Grote and Geddes, though he differs from them in some important respects. See also the same author's Homer and History (Lond.: 1915).

LEMCKE, L. Ueber einige bei der Kritik der traditionellen schottischen Balladen zu beobachtende Grundsätze. In *Jahrbuch f. rom. u. eng. Lit.*, 4: 1, 142, 297. Leipz.: 1862.

"Ein Blick auf die Entwickelungsgesetze fast aller Kulturvölker lässt eine Thatsache erkennen, welche; wie man glauben muss, auf einem Naturgesetze beruht, nämlich dass überall wo auf historischem Boden auf der Mischung verschiedener Volkselemente eine *neue* Nation entsteht, der Neubildungsprocess selbst eine erste, unmittelbare Quelle der neuen nationalen Dichtung wird. Wenn es erlaubt ist, Vorgänge in der moralischen Welt mit solchen der physischen Welt zu parallelisiren, so möchte man sagen: die Poesie begleitet den natürlichen Mischungsprocess von Völkern wie die Wärmeentwickelung denjenigen der chemischen Elemente" (p. 148). But is the ballad produced by a fusion of nations? And as for the epic, does it not more frequently grow out of a collision of causes, beliefs, clans, nations, civilizations, than out of a fusion?

LETOURNEAU, C.
Cited in § 5.

LILLY, M. L. The Georgic. A Contribution to the Study of the Vergilian Type of Didactic Poetry. Diss., Johns Hopkins Univ. Baltimore: 1917.

Chap. III The Relation of the Georgic to the Pastoral.

LOISE, F. Histoire de la poésie. L'Allemagne dans sa litt., etc. Bruxelles: 1873.

A running history, with general discussion of German epics and epic-romances. See pp. 51–71, 149–238.

Loise, F. Histoire de la poésie en rapport avec la civilisation dans l'antiquité et chez les peuples modernes de race latine. L'Antiquité. Bruxelles: 1887.

The introduction contains some general remarks upon the development of literature in connection with social influences. P. 98: Homer found his inspiration in the reality of past events, which he idealized; the poet has indispensable need of a perspective of events and a prestige of imagination. On moral purpose, p. 102; on Virgil, p. 204 ff.; on the character of the epic productions of the first centuries of Christianity, p. 294 ff.

Lütjens, A. Der Zwerg in der deutschen Heldendichtung des Mittelalters. In *German. Abhandlungen*, No. 38. 1911.

An example of how a particular subject or detail may be isolated for comparative study.

Macaulay, T. B.

See above, § 8.

Macaulay's proof of his premise that as civilization advances poetry almost necessarily declines, is suggestive to the student of epic history; but the doctrine, unless carefully circumscribed, is misleading. With the advance of civilization the making of poetry tends to become less and less a popular habit, more and more the gift of a few chosen souls; but with this specialization the poetic inspiration grows more complex and profound, the poetic result finer and greater. See also Macaulay's introduction to his Lays of Ancient Rome.

Macculloch, J. A. The Childhood of Fiction: A Study of Folk Tales and Primitive Thought. N.Y.: 1905.

A collection and analysis of early folk tales and folk-tale incidents such as are often later embodied in the epic.

Mackail, J. W. Lectures on Poetry. Lond.: 1911.

P. 48 ff. Virgil and Virgilianism; p. 72 ff. The Aeneid; p. 123 ff. Arabian Epic and Romantic Poetry; p. 154 ff. The Divine Comedy.

MACKENZIE, A. S. The Evolution of Literature. N.Y.: 1911.

The author attempts a survey of the development of literature under four heads: primitive, barbaric, autocratic, and democratic (cf. Posnett). A provisional induction of general laws of development is set forth in the last chapter. The analysis is not in every respect adequate; the divisions are somewhat disproportionate; and assumption and description often take the place of fact or argument; but the author has made an honest attempt toward a scientific method. See table of contents for passages dealing with epic, lyric, and drama in different stages of civilization.

MACRÌ-LEONE, F. La bucolica latina nella letteratura italiana del secolo XIV, con una introduzione sulla bucolica latina nel medio evo. Torino: 1889.

MANITIUS, M. Mittelalterliche Umdeutung antiker Sagenstoffe. In *Zeitschr. für vergleich. Littgesch.*, 15: 151 ff.

Shows some of the characteristic changes which were undergone by the common narrative material of the Middle Ages.

MANLY, J. M. Literary Forms and the New Theory of the Origin of Species.

See above, § 5.

MANTZ, H. E. The Non-Dramatic Pastoral in Europe in the 18th Century. In *Pubs. Mod. Lang. Assoc.*, 31: 421–447.

MARSAN, J. La pastorale dramatique en France à la fin du 16^{e} et au commencement du 17^{e} siècle, Paris: 1905.

Contains much information on French, Italian, and Spanish pastoral poetry.

MARSH, A. R. Epic Poetry. In the Universal Cyclopaedia (Johnson's), vol. IV. N.Y.: 1900.

A very informing article, in which the development of the French epos is taken as typical of the growth of all great popular epics. The summary of the stages of epic development given in the second column of page 141 is sound and conservative.

Massing, H. Die Geistlichkeit im altfranz. Volksepos. Inaug. Diss., Giessen. Darmstadt: 1904.

Meier, J. Werden und Leben des Volksepos. Halle: 1909. Reviewed by A. Heusler in *Anzeiger für deutsches Altertum*, 33: 129–136.

A brief, scholarly study of the interrelation of saga, lay, and epic. Three stages of growth are noted: das epische Lied, die Rhapsodie, das Gesamtepos.

Meyer, P. Recherches sur l'épopée française. Paris: 1867.

A critical examination of the first edition of L'Histoire poétique de Charlemagne by Gaston Paris and Gautier's Épopées françaises, vol. I. The greater part of the book is taken up with considerations of the French epopee; but on pages 5 and 64–66 may be found a criticism of the theory that the epic (French epic) developed from earlier lyrics which celebrated heroic deeds almost immediately upon their performance, or shortly after. For a summary of Meyer's views on this subject see p. 75.

Miklosich, F. Beiträge zur Kenntniss d. slavischen Volksepos. *Denkschr. d. Akad. d. Wiss., Philos.-Hist. Cl.* Wien: 1870. P. 55.

Miklosich, F. Die Darstellung im slavischen Volksepos. *Denkschr. d. Akad. d. Wiss., Philos.-Hist. Cl.* Wien: 1890. Abh. III.

Discusses in the opening paragraphs the difference between the *Naturepos* and the *Kunstepos*.

Miller, G. M. The Dramatic Element in the Popular Ballad. In *Univ. Studies of the Univ. of Cincinnati*, Series 2, vol. I, No. 1. 1905.

The ballad tells a story, often partly in the objective narrative of the epic. It is in lyric verse, and is meant to be sung. But the great importance of the dramatic element in the ballad can be seen from its origin and development, from its connection with the dramatic dance and with the drama, from the strong dramatic character of closely

connected parallels, from the dramatic elements brought out by an analysis of the ballad as it has come down to us — dramatic impersonality, dramatic presentation of action and character, dramatic structure and form. In a peculiar way, then, the popular ballad is the best survival of primitive poetry, the best representative of all folk-poetry; it is distinguished from all other poetic types by its unique union of epic, lyric and dramatic elements (p. 46).

What becomes of these observations if the true account of the origin of the epic is that of Gaston Paris, Jeanroy, and Henderson (see Henderson, above)? — Compare A. Beatty, The St. George, or Mummers' Plays, A Study in the Protology of the Drama (*Trans. Wisconsin Acad.*, 15: 273 ff. 1906).

Moorman, F. W. William Browne. His Britannia's Pastorals and the Pastoral Poetry of the Elizabethan Age. Strassburg: 1897. In *Quellen und Forschungen.*

Mörner, J. von. Die deutschen und französischen Heldengedichte des Mittelalters als Quelle für die Culturgeschichte. Leipz.: 1886.

Not a work of literary criticism, but valuable to the critic because it analyzes the relations of various hero-tales to medieval civilization.

Moulton, R. G. The Modern Study of Literature. 1915.

See references to this work, above, §§ 2, 8. For evolution in epic poetry see pp. 132–161.

The evolution of the Organic Epic (e.g., Homeric epic) is summarized as follows:

> It [this evolution] involves the transition from the floating poetry of minstrel recitation, in a state of constant change, to the age of fixed or book poetry, that brings with it individual authorship. We begin with the unit story; in the free variations of floating poetry we readily understand the fusion of many stories together. In time there arise certain heroic names, or other topics, which become centers around which there is an ever-increasing aggregation of stories; stories originally (it may be) told of other heroes, but now brought into association with a popular name. We get an Achilles cycle of warrior stories, an Odysseus cycle of wandering adventures. . . . Such an heroic cycle is, of course, not

a poem, but a state of things in poetry: a mass of incidents having no necessary connection with one another, yet attributed to a common hero. Then we pass over the boundary into the age of written literature and individual authorship: it becomes possible for an individual poet to take the indiscriminate incidents of the Achilles cycle and organize the whole into the harmonious plot of the Iliad. . . . The product is an Organic Epic: from the unit cell of the single story we have a development of complex literary organism with its parts in perfect co-ordination (pp. 133–135).

MÜLLER, W. Mythologie der deutschen Heldensage. Heilbronn: 1886. Zur Mythologie der griechischen und deutschen Heldensage. Heilbronn: 1889.

Müller, with a modified euhemerism, attempts to trace a portion of the mythical material of the German and Greek epics to an origin in historical facts. Compare A. Fécamp, Le Poëme de Gudrun (Paris: 1892), pp. 97–181. A recent discussion of the relations of historical fact and epical poetry is W. Leaf's Homer and History (1915), which scouts the German theories of *Sagenverscheibung* (i.e., transplanting of legends from historical sources to later historical events) and of the descent of epic legends from nature-myths.

MÜLLER and DONALDSON. A History of Ancient Greece. 3 vols. Lond.: 1858.

Vol. I, pp. 40–53 The Homeric poems attest a pre-Homeric bardic poetry. See Jebb, and references under § 12, I, A.

MURE, W. A Critical History of the Language and Literature of Ancient Greece. 2d ed. 5 vols. Lond.: 1854.

Vol. I, pp. 170–172 Epic and lyric, their origin and characteristics.

Examine the reasons assigned for the probable priority of the epic. Is lyric poetry, as compared with epic, "speculative and discursive"?

MURRAY, G. The Rise of the Greek Epic. Oxford: 1907. 2d ed. Revised and enlarged. 1911.

Lectures IV–X, pp. 91–252 (1st ed.).

Professor Murray belongs to the school of Wolf, Lachmann, Kirchhoff, and Leaf. His account of the problems of the origin and development of the Greek epics is enriched by frequent reference to similar problems associated with other epics, and by the application of anthropological knowledge (derived chiefly from Dr. Frazer's works) to the exposition of many characteristics of the Homeric poems. The book, therefore, is unusually valuable to the student who wishes to study comparatively the historical problems involved. Side by side with this book the student should consult Lang's Homer and the Epic (see above), which presents, with much the same knowledge and method, the opposite, or anti-Wolfian, view of the origin and development of the poems.

Mustard, W. P. Later Echoes of the Greek Bucolic Poets. In *Am. Jr. of Phil.*, 30: 245. 1909.

On the influence of Theocritus, Bion, and Moschus on English, French, Italian, and German pastoral poetry. See the same author's Virgil's Georgics and the British Poets (*ibid.*, 29: 1. 1908); The Eclogues of Baptista Mantuanus (Baltimore: 1911), edited, with introduction; The Piscatory Eclogues of Jacopo Sannazaro (1914); The Eclogues of Andrelinus and Arnolletus (1918), etc.

Myers, Irene, T. A Study in Epic Development. N.Y.: 1901. In *Yale Studies in English*, No. XI.

By a brief review of the theories of epic poetry the author endeavors to show that the critics are agreed upon only one fundamental distinction of the epic from other literary species, —its narrative form. Behind the epic lie earlier stages of narrative development, and the author aims to follow these to the point where the epic appears, and (somewhat after the fashion of Posnett) to parallel them with the stages of political development leading to the appearance of a national form of government approximately synchronous with the appearance of the epic. An examination of early phases of literary and political development shows that the earliest literary product is correspondent in its indistinctness and disjointed form with the indefinite organization of the clan. "As the people advance towards the more centralized tribal organization, and recognize a political head, they manifest also a tendency to elevate certain representative figures in their legends. When a consciousness of nationality has been aroused, and the tribes have found a basis for unity, this unity finds an expression in a national ideal in their songs. The progress of the narrative is from a formless expression, without plan or predominant incident or figure, towards a form in which a plot is developed, and in which incidents and figures group themselves with reference to their relative importance to a central idea or hero" (p. 86). The examination is then extended to the German and Greek epics and peoples, with similar results. The national genius realizes itself in government and in epic; according to the tendencies and strength of that genius the epic "appears as prose or verse, in dissociated sagas or in more or less unified national songs" (p. 147).

Though the premises are not entirely trustworthy, and the conclusions too easily drawn, the essay offers a convenient introduction to the historical method of attack as practised at the present day.

NITZSCH, G. W. Die Sagenpoesie der Griechen kritisch dargestellt. 3 Th. Braunschweig: 1852.

See Parts I and II for the "epic cycle" (compare Welcker); Part III for the relation of the Aeschylean trilogy to the epic; pp. 439-446 deal with this last question in the general and abstract.

NITZSCH, G. W. Beiträge zur Geschichte der epischen Poesie der Griechen. Leipz.: 1862.

A believer in stages of evolution in the national epic, but of evolution which reached its climax in the creative genius of the individual poet, Nitzsch was the foremost opponent of the Wolfian school. "Drei Stufen: Volkssage, kleinere Einzellieder und auf Grund dieser dann erst grössere Gebilde, bemessen nach dem innewohnenden Motiv der Bewegung, beseelt nach dem Phantasieglauben des Volksgeistes, den der ausführende Dichter theilt, und den er erst in Charakteren der Helden und Götter, und bei den Wechselwirkungen zwischen Menschen- und Götterwelt die Handlung zur recht lebensvollen Anschaulichkeit ausprägt" (p. 62). Homer's relations to his predecessors and followers are discussed on pp. 130–298. See also the same author's earlier pronunciamentos, the Meletemata (1830) and De Historia Homeri (Hannover: 1830–37).

NYROP, K. Storia dell' epopea francese nel medio evo. Trans., from the original Danish edition of 1883, by E. Gorra. Torino: 1888.

In this valuable study is included a *résumé* of previous works upon the same subject. Compare *Romania*, 14: 143 ff.

OUVRÉ, H. Les formes littéraires de la pensée grecque. Paris: 1900.

An attempt to trace the evolution of Greek thought and its literary form. The work is discursive and lacks clearly defined theses.

PALEY, F. A. Remarks on Professor Mahaffy's Account of the Rise and Progress of Epic Poetry, in his History of Classical Greek Literature. Lond.: 1881.

The argument (p. 43) is to the effect that the Cyclic Epics represent older and more authentic versions of the tale of Troy than do the Homeric poems.

PANIZZI, A. An Essay on the Romantic Narrative Poetry of the Italians. Lond.: 1830.

In the first vol. of Panizzi's edition of Boiardo and Ariosto.

The author treats of romantic fabulous narratives considered as a general European phenomenon, and touches particularly upon their forms in France and Italy, noting, among other writers, Pulci, Cieco, Bernardo Tasso, etc. The essay is largely antiquated and not seldom in error as to facts; but it deserves study. For references on the Italian romantic epics, see below, § 12, VI, B–E.

PANZER, F. Das altdeutsche Volksepos. Halle: 1903.

The author maintains that repetitions in the epic are due originally to an instinctive habit of emphasizing the typical aspect of the thing repeated, and that the surrender of these repetitions by later poets signifies an advance to more individual habits of thought. It is then suggested that certain discrepancies in details commonly found in epic narrative are due not to different recensions, but to the typical tone of the narrative, which does not concern itself intimately with individual details or with any contradictions in details.

PANZER, F. Märchen, Sage und Dichtung. München: 1905.

Holds that epical poems have developed not only from poetic songs dealing with legendary material, but also from fairy tales to which epic technique has been applied. Compare the Odyssey, and the instances in German epic cited by Panzer, p. 42 ff., and see Panzer's monographs on the German epic cited in § 12, XI.

PARIS, G. La littérature française au moyen âge. 5th ed. Paris: 1914.

See pp. 35–156 (3d ed.) for one of the best short accounts of the medieval French epic and romance. The *Tableau Chronologique* (p. 271 ff.) gives at a glance a *résumé* of the mass of French medieval epic and epical narrative. Compare the volume on Mediaeval French Literature, by the same author (in the series of Temple Cyclopaedic Primers). Other important works by this master of medieval French poetry, including his invaluable Hist. poétique de Charlemagne, are noted above, §§ 5, 8.

PAUL, H. Grundriss der germanischen Philologie. 2d ed. Strassburg: 1900–09. 3d ed. 1911+.

See Bd. II, Abt. I, for history and bibliography of the epics and epical narratives in the ancient Germanic tongues (Gothic, German, Dutch, Friesian, Norwegian and Icelandic, Swedish-Danish, and Old and Middle English). This important work is cited repeatedly in §§ 6, 12.

PEACOCK, T. L. Works. 3 vols. Lond.: 1875.

Vol. III, pp. 324–338 The Four Ages of Poetry.

The article may also be found in Cook's edition of Shelley's Defense of Poetry (see Gayley and Scott, § 20). Peacock's satirical emphasis upon the relation of superstition to the epic and his remarks concerning the general social conditions of the "Golden Age" are worthy of serious consideration.

PERCY, BISHOP. Reliques of Ancient English Poetry. 1st ed. Lond.: 1765.

Ancient Metrical Romances. See Bohn's ed., 1900, vol. II.

For Percy's influence see above, § 9, VII, C.

PIDAL, R. M. L'épopée castillane à travers la littérature espagnole. Paris: 1910.

This is the best work on the Spanish epic. The author studies "the formation or crystallization of the epic material, and its later diffusion and evolution in Spanish literature.". A long line of epic material preceded the epic proper. The origin of the Spanish epic is not, according to Pidal, French; he supports a thesis which is similar to Rajna's theory of the Germanic origin of the French *épopée*. Much attention is given to historical and social backgrounds: the antagonism of Castile and Leon is traced in the Poème de Fernand González and the Chanson du siège de Zamore; the relation of the Cid (Cantar de Meo Cid) to national life is expounded. The last four chapters consider the Enfances de Rodrique, later redactions, the decay of epic material in the *Romancero*, and the diffusion of epic subjects in the classical period of Spanish drama and in modern Spanish poetry.

POSNETT, H. M. Comparative Literature. N.Y.: 1896.

Posnett's assignment of choral song, hero-saga, ballad, epic, lyric, drama, idyl, etc., to various stages of national development, is fruitful of suggestion. He does not believe in universal conceptions of any type of literature; consequently, not in definitions (pp. 42–44).

Behind the Iliad and Odyssey existed poetry of local sympathies and songs of local sentiment long before the genius of one master-bard, or of many, built up the Greek epics into the forms in which they have reached us. . . . The picture of social life in the Homeric poems is that of men who have left the barbarous isolation and exclusiveness of clan life far behind them . . . and are gaining wider sympathies and artistic refinement under the guidance of chiefs and kings (pp. 99–100).

Both the choral and the personal poetry of the clan give way to the songs of the chief's hall. Perhaps one of the earliest shapes of heroic poetry was the genealogical poem . . . blending the communal personality of the clan with the individual heroism of the chief. . . . Old songs of eponymous clan-ancestors would meet such beginnings of epic poetry halfway, and the glory of the clan's ideal parentage would be easily transferred to the personal ancestry of the chief (pp. 158–159).

Pp. 152–158 are devoted to a criticism of Victor Hugo's theory (Preface to "Cromwell," p. 26) concerning the priority of lyric to epic, which, according to Posnett, is "an inversion of the order in which the personality of man has been developed." Is not Posnett here, like many of the psychological theorists, whom he affects to despise, confounding the process of mental growth with the evolution of artistic expression? If the savage regards Force and Law as objective and unsympathetic, is he more likely to express his opinions of them in an objective, contemplative, and epic manner, or to address them in the naïve utterance of the choral, lyric, prayer, and ode? Does Posnett maintain consistently one view or the other? Compare Gayley and Scott, §§ 2 and 17.

Pound, L. The Beginnings of Poetry. In *Pubs. Mod. Lang. Assoc.*, 32: 201–232. 1917.

In the light chiefly of songs of the American Indians the author re-examines the following hypotheses: "the inseparableness of primitive dance, music, and song; the simultaneous mass-composition of primitive song; mass-ownership of primitive song; the narrative character of primitive song."

Quadrio, F. S. Della storia e della ragione d'ogni poesia. 7 vols. Bologna e Milano: 1739–1752.

See above, § 8.

QUINET, E. Œuvres complètes. 30 vols. Paris: 1857(?).

In vol. IX, De l'histoire de la poésie, an evolutionary theory of composition is developed. See also Quinet's ridicule of the Wolfian theory in Bk. V of his L'Esprit nouveau (vol. XXVII of the Œuvres). His point is that the poetic imagination, evident in the Iliad and the Odyssey, "ne se contente pas de rédiger, elle crée."

RABB, K. M. National Epics. Chicago: 1896.

See above, § 8.

RAJNA, PIO. Le origine dell' epopea francese. Firenze: 1884.

An exhaustive work, which is recognized both as a standard authority and as an Italian classic. The introduction, on the epic and its origins, discusses the poetics of the epic, its laws, its unity, etc. Of especial interest are Chaps. XV and XVI on the relation of French and German epics, Chap. XVIII on epic rhythms, and the concluding chapter on the extension and propagation of the epic. See also the same author's Storia ed epopea, in *Archivo storico italiano*, XLIII, 1.

RAMBAUD, A. Cycle de Vladimir. In *Rev. d. Deux Mondes*, 3: 4: 41.

RAMBAUD, A. La Russie épique. Paris: 1876.

Highly important for students of the Russian epic. The work takes up in order the following phases of the subject: (1) the legendary epic; (2) the historical epic; (3) the adventitious epic (i.e., epics which show the influence of Greece, Persia, France, etc.); (4) the Little-Russian epic.

REEVE, CLARA. Progress of Romance. 2 vols. Colchester: 1785.

One of the earliest attempts at the historical method in England. See above, § 9, VII, C.

RENNERT, H. A. The Spanish Pastoral Romances. New, revised ed. Philadelphia: 1912. *Pubs. Univ. Penn., Dept. Rom. Langs. and Lits.*, Extra Series, No. 1.

See references to pastoral poetry.

SAINTSBURY, G. (Ed.) Periods of European Literature. 12 vols. N.Y.: 1897+.

A series of volumes which treat comparatively, under different epochs, the literature of Europe as a whole. May be consulted for literary movements contemporary with the various European epics.

SCHANZ, M. Geschichte der römischen Litteratur.

See above, § 5.

SCHNEEGANS, E. Die Volkssage und das altfranzös. Heldengedicht. In *Neue Heidelberger Jahrbücher*, 1897, pp. 58–67.

A discussion of the relation of history, folk saga, and epic. Schneegans is not in accord with the theory that the saga serves as a connecting link between the other two. The epic, he thinks, is nearer to historical fact than the saga with its popular idealization of particular episodes and heroes.

SCHOPF, A. Nationalepos und Balladendichtung: Eine ethnographische Studie. Wien: 1881.

A small affair with a big name, written for juveniles.

SCHURÉ, É.

See above, § 5.

SEYMOUR, T. D. Life in the Homeric Age. N.Y.: 1907. 2d ed. 1914.

The book in general is concerned with setting forth in regard to Homeric antiquities "simply what may be learned from the Homeric poems themselves, with such illustration as is obvious or naturally presented from other sources." But in the Introduction will be found a clean-cut summary of the status of Homeric theory in 1914. The problems discussed are historical, such as: basis, myth *vs.* legend, manner of composition, strata in the composition, relation of the poet's age and culture to the age and culture depicted in the poems. — Chap. XVII presents a convenient synopsis of the Schliemann-Dörpfeld discoveries in the Troad.

SISMONDI, J. C. L. S. DE. De la littérature du midi de l'Europe. 4 vols. Paris: 1839.

English translation by T. Roscoe, Historical View of the Literature of the South of Europe (2 vols. N.Y.: 1855).

References to all types; superseded, but historically important.

SMITHSON, G. A. The Old English Christian Epic. A study of the plot technique of the Juliana, the Elene, the Andreas, and the Christ, in comparison with the Beowulf and with the Latin literature of the Middle Ages. In *Univ. of Calif. Pubs. Mod. Philol.*, 1: 303–400. Berkeley, Calif.: 1910.

A careful and independent study of the derivation of the technique of the Old English Christian epic from the Beowulf and from Latin saints' legends, hymns, dramatic colloquies, and the service and sermons of the Advent. "The Old English poems were practically uninfluenced by the Virgilian epics."

SOERENSEN, A. Beitrag zur Geschichte der Entwickelung der serbischen Heldendichtung. In *Archiv für slavische Philologie*, vols. 14–20. 1892–98.

SOMMER, H. O. Erster Versuch über die englische Hirtendichtung. Marburg: 1888.

"A useful sketch of the eclogue in English literature from 1510 to 1805, though superficial and not always accurate."

SPIELHAGEN, F. Neue Beiträge zur Theorie und Technik der Epik und Dramatik. Leipz.: 1898.

In Chap. II the author contends that the old folk epic is impossible in modern times. Romances and the novel have taken its place.

STEDMAN, E. C. The Nature and Elements of Poetry.

See above, § 8.

STEENSTRUP, J. C. H. R. Vore Folkeviser fra Middelalderen. Copenhagen: 1891. English translation by E. G. Cox, The Medieval Popular Ballad. *Univ. of Wash. Pubs. Eng.*, III. Boston: 1914.

The standard Danish work on the ballad.

"The method is both intensive and comparative. It lays bare in great detail the original conditions of production, — how ballads were sung to the accompaniment of dancing, — the nature and purpose of the refrain, and the structure of the rime, rhythm, and melody. It investigates the attitude of ballads toward questions of moral import, their feeling for religion, patriotism, and historical truth, and their use of nature. The comparisons with the Norse sagas and the ballads of Germany, together with the plenteous use of extracts from the ballads of Denmark, all combine to set forth attractively the perplexing and fascinating question of ballad origins and distributions."

STEINTHAL, H. Das Epos. In *Zeitschrift f. Völkerpsychologie und Sprachwissenschaft*, 5: 1–57. 1868.

An application of folk-psychology to the development and classification of the epic, and especially to the Homeric question. In the light of the results of a preliminary discussion of the nature of folk poetry, the problem of its relation to the epic is approached. The people as a whole work at their poetry, forming and reforming it as they do their speech or customs, like bees at their cell-building. Every song must have come first of all from one individual, but as soon as it was sung it belonged to the entire folk. Moreover, folk poetry is always, like speech, in the course of change: it is never a finished product. 'Folk poetry' is a *nomen actionis*. Consequently, there are no *Volksgedichte*, but *Volksdichten*; no *Volksepos*, but *Volksepik*. Folk poetry has no independent existence of its own, but is entirely dependent upon the vicissitudes of the development of the folk (pp. 1–12). There are three forms, or stages, of epic composition: (1) the isolated form, — separate songs each celebrating a particular incident; (2) the agglutinative form, — a group of songs celebrating the various deeds of a single hero, e.g., the romances; (3) the organic form, — a great cycle built by the communal spirit, with organic relation of parts, interdependent members, unity of development, etc. — There is a greater difference between (2) and (3) than between (1) and (2), but (1) may stand near to (3). (1) and (2) have a lyric character. Passage from one form to another is dependent upon a revolution of poetic spirit, and involves a re-creation of material. The epic is no mere patching together of materials from the agglutinative stage. Its tone and its matter are essentially different; it is a new creation, using the older songs only as material and infusing a foreign spirit into this. The prerequisites for this organic epic are a copious mythology, an historical importance of the people, and a store of valuable legends proceeding from these. But the poetizing folk-spirit, with its "ideal unity," is still the creating force, and it creates the Idea which brings the material into organic form (compare Woodberry's Appreciation of Literature, under § 8, above. Is not Steinthal's "Idea" Woodberry's social function of the epic idealized,—philosophically and imaginatively rarefied into an abstract?).—Inasmuch as the whole epos is not sung at once, but only in parts (compare Lang's Introd. to Comparetti, p. xxi), wherein lies its practical unity? Steinthal replies: in the ideal power, or creative force, which makes the organic whole and permeates each part. The Kalevala is an example. This ideal power is not the work of the diaskeuasts, but is discovered by them (12–57).—*Query:* Are not the revolution of material, the new tone, the new idea, which Steinthal makes the prerequisites of the organic epic, the product of an individual author rather than of the communal spirit? This communal authorship, when pushed to such an extreme, necessitates the awkward "ideal unity" of Steinthal's third stage.—Compare Krohn, above.

STIMMING, A. Ueber den provenzalischen Girart von Rossillon: Ein Beitrag zur Entwickelungsgeschichte der Volksepen. Halle: 1888.

See p. 2 for two stages of evolution of the romantic folk epics.

SYMONDS, J. A. The Greek Poets. 1873–76.

Vol. I, Chaps. I–IV. Compare above, § 8.

"Upon the overthrow of old forms of government and the rise of individualism the lyric and then the drama appear." The epic period, that of impersonality, precedes both. Compare Hugo and Posnett.

SYMONDS, J. A. Renaissance in Italy.

See above, § 8.

TEN BRINK, B. Early English Literature. Trans. by H. M. Kennedy. 3 vols. Lond.: 1883.

Vol. I, Book I; especially pp. 13–32 English national poetry before the Conquest.

A valuable contribution to the history of the development of early literary types. Ten Brink calls attention to the 'property-rights' of the community rather than of the individual in the earliest types of poetry, shows that hymnic poetry is the precursor of the epic, traces the evolution of the German epic song from the hero-saga into the epic, and describes the circumstances which prevented the primitive epic of England from attaining the development of the Homeric epos. The remarks concerning the Nibelungenlied, the Lay of Hildebrand, and the Beowulf are worthy of critical consideration. Posnett (Comp. Lit., p. 8) criticizes ten Brink's conclusions concerning the Beowulf.

TERRET, V. Homère: étude historique et critique. Paris: 1899.

The scope of this mammoth work is thus set forth:

> Après avoir résumé dans les trois premiers chapitres tout ce que le témoignage des anciens et la science contemporaine nous ont appris de plus certain sur la biographie du grand poëte ionien, sur la composition et la transmission de ses épopées, il a pris à part chaque chant, chaque épisode, chaque scène, les a fait passer successivement à l'épreuve d'une critique sévère mais impartiale; et finalement il a cru pouvoir formuler cette conclusion: que l'opinion traditionnelle de l'antiquité qui attribue à son seul Homère l'Iliade et l'Odyssée se concilie parfaitement avec les découvertes les plus récentes de l'archéologie et de la philologie (p. x).

TEUFFEL, W. S. History of Roman Literature.

See above, § 5; consult for Virgil, Lucan, Lucretius, etc.; also for writers of pastoral, idyl, elegy.

USENER, H. Der Stoff des griechischen Epos. In *Sitzungsb. d. kais. Akad. d. Wiss. zu Wien*, Bd. 137, Ab. 3. Wien: 1898.

A worth-while discussion of the origin of epic materials in myth and saga. Anthropological.

VÉRON, E. Aesthetics. Trans. by W. H. Armstrong. Lond.: 1879.

P. 354 ff.

The development of the *morale* of the epic reaches from the adoration of the strong and the instinctive egotism that has its basis in a constant pre-occupation with dangers, through the higher stages of an evolving human sympathy. Contributory to the growth of such sympathy were the development of family affections, and increased solidarity of national life, and, in recent times, the discoveries and inventions of science that have brought humanity into a closer union.

VICO, GIAMBATTISTA. Opere di G. Vico. Ed. by G. Ferrari. 6 vols. Milano: 1852–1854.

Principi di scienza nuova, Libro terzo, Della discoverta del vero Omero (vol. V, pp. 422–461). Cf. R. Flint, Vico (Edinb.: 1884. In W. Knight's Philosophical Classics for English Readers), pp. 173–178; R. C. Jebb, Homer (6th ed. Boston: 1904), pp. 106–107; F. A. Wolf, Museum der Alterthumswissenschaft, I (1807), p. 555 ff. (or Kleine Schriften, II, 157 ff.).

Vico's "Discovery of the True Homer" is an anticipation of the "Wolfian theory." Vico opened the question in the notes (1722) to his Diritto universale. In the second edition of the Scienza nuova (1730) the subject was expanded to the compass of an entire 'Book.'

The true Homer is here affirmed to be the Greek people itself, in its ideal or heroic character, relating its own history in national poetry. In others words, the Homeric poems are regarded as not the creations of the genius of an individual, but the formations of the genius of a race working through a period of about 460 years. The Iliad was the work of the youth of Homer — that is to say, of the infancy of Greece. . . . The Odyssey, on the other hand, was the work of the old age of Homer — that is to say, of a time when the passions of the Greeks began to be cooled by reflection. . . . The Pisistratidæ first divided and disposed the Homeric poems into the Iliad and the Odyssey. . . . Under the name of Homer there has come down to us the work of many heroic poets. . . . The two poems . . . were probably elaborated and continued by various authors during many successive generations. Thus the true Homer is discovered (Flint, pp. 174–175).

After Wolf had published his Prolegomena (see below), Cesarotti pointed out to him the anticipation of his theory in Vico's "Discovery"; Wolf replied with an inadequate article on Vico in his Museum, as noted above. For Perrault's 'denial' of Homer see his Parallèle des anciens et des modernes, 4th Dialogue (1692).

Vigfusson, G., and Powell, F. Y. Corpus Poeticum Boreale. 2 vols. Oxford: 1883.

The Introduction and the various Essays scattered through the two volumes give an excellent idea of Northern poetry and of the nature of the problems of the development of the epic material of the North. See vol. I, p. xcvii ff.

Voigt, G. Die Wiederbelebung des classischen Alterthums, etc. 2d ed. 2 vols. Berlin: 1880–1881.

Vol. II, p. 407 On the paucity of epic poetry in the first century of the Renaissance.

Voretzsch, C. Märchen, Sage, Epos. In *Beilage der Allgemeinen Zeitung*, No. 234 (1897).

Maintains that the epic develops from the hero-saga.

Wackernagel, W. Poetik, Rhetorik und Stilistik. 3d ed. Halle a. S.: 1906.

Pp. 52–155.

This volume, which is evolved by an ingenious combination of historical and philosophical methods of criticism, contains one of the best and most complete analyses of the epic to be found among German writings upon poetics. The author considers the "epos of national objectivity" and the "epos of individual subjectivity." Under the former he discusses the historical priority of epical poetry; epical vision as "Anschauung einer göttlichen, einer religiösen oder sittlichen Idee in Form einer durch Kausalität verbundenen Reihenfolge von aüsseren Tatsachen" (p. 59), — which holds for epic poems of all sorts, of all peoples and times;

primitive forms of epical vision, viz., saga, myth, fairy story, animal saga (63–73); communal character of epical vision, — the poet expressing this communal vision, not an individual point of view (73–74); the expression of epical vision in oral tradition and the influence of the latter upon the former (74–86); the definition of early epical song — the first stage from which all poetry derives — "eine dem ganzen Volke angehörige, durch den lebendigen Gesang mitteilbare Darstellung einzelner Sagen, Mythen, Märchen und Tiersagen" (85); differentiation of epic, lyric, and drama from the primitive epical stuff as due to social changes and the development of individualism, the order of succession being epical-epic, lyrical-epic, epical-lyric, lyrical-lyric, drama (88 ff.). Under the second main head (epic of individual subjectivity) Wackernagel discusses the rise of epical epic through progressive cycles of heroic songs and the achievement of artistic unity; the nature and laws of pure epic (Iliad, Odyssey, Nibelungenlied); its relation to mythology and history; its decay in romance and historical composition (91–120); the lyrical epic — hymns, elegies, folk-songs, ballads, romances — of ancient and modern peoples (120–131); the didactic epic — idyl, satire, fable, parable, proverb (131–155). For the peculiar conditions under which the modern epic labors, see pp. 113–117. — In what he says about the "epos of national objectivity" one may ask whether Wackernagel does not beg the question of the lyrical quality of primitive mythic, magic, and heroic utterance. One feels at times that the scholarly and most original and suggestive author is not sufficiently acquainted with the actual nature and conditions of primitive song and story. Does he allow philosophical speculation and system to take the place of anthropological facts? Does not his definition of epical vision connote a philosophical consciousness that is alien to primitive man? Is his derivation of poetic kinds historically sound? Does he show the actual, historical transitions from type to type, or does he deduce the succession of types from *a priori* psychological premises? How does he justify his divisions and subdivisions of the "subjective epic," — genetically or analytically?

Warton, T. History of Poetry. 3 vols. Lond.: 1774–1781.

See the essay on the Origin of Romantic Fiction in Europe; also R. Price's Preface on the same subject, found in the four-volume edition of 1824.

Waterman, T. T. The Explanatory Element in the Folk-Tales of the North American Indians. In *The Journal of American Folk-Lore*, Vol. 27, No. 103. 1914.

"As far as the present form of our mythical tales in North America is concerned, the story is the original thing, the explanation an afterthought."

Watts-Dunton, W. T. Article on Poetry. Encyc. Brit.

Epics divided into two groups, of growth and art. Has the author traced clearly the stages of the former kind of epic? Note the characteristics of each type and the exemplification of the manner in which epics conform to the scheme. As epics become artistic they gain in unity of impression and of motive; as they advance from East to West they are characterized by the greater freedom with which the heroes act. See above, § 8.

Welcker, F. G. Der epische Cyclus oder die homerischen Dichter. 1st ed. Bonn: 1835–1849. 2d ed. 2 Th. Bonn: 1865–1882.

A voluminous and astonishing work, one of the most significant in the history of philology. It furnishes a lucid discussion of the respective contributions to the Iliad — of prehistoric lays, the great formative poet, and the later interpolators, and maintains that the cyclic epics must have been preceded by an Iliad. For an estimate of the indebtedness to it of the scholars of the middle of the 19th century, see G. Nitzsch, Sagenpoesie der Griechen, p. 19.

Wernaer, R. M. The New Constructive Criticism.

See above, § 5.

Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, U. von. Homerische Untersuchungen. In *Philol. Untersuchungen* (ed. by A. Kiessling and U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff. Hft. VII). Berlin: 1884.

WILAMOWITZ-MOELLENDORFF, U. VON. Die griechische Literatur des Altertums. In Hinneberg's Die Kultur d. Gegenwart, Tl. I, Abt. VIII. Berlin u. Leipz.: 1905.

Pp. 4–16 Das ionische Epos; 135 ff. Eidyllia.

In these two articles we have the views of one of the foremost Greek scholars upon questions of Homeric composition and unity. "The origin of the Iliad and the Odyssey, the long way that the poetic craft must earlier have traversed, will always remain a mystery; efforts to explain it by the mistaken assumption of a folk epic spontaneously emerging in the development of the human race have failed. The most valuable analogies are to be found in the Romanic, especially the Old-French, epos" (Ion. Epos, p. 5). "Without question Homer was a man, by 700 B.C. the acknowledged poet of several epics. His lifetime was so remote that, being of Aeolian stock, he had been Ionicized just like his epic; or else he was Ionian and only the memory of the provenience of the epic had Aeolized him. In the latter case he had a hand in the composition not of the earliest but of the latest parts of the Iliad. Whether he took the decisive first step and invented the recitative verse and the spoken epos, or took the last and composed our Iliad (wrote it down, as I do not hesitate to say), his services were great. To assume that the poem is of one composer is a mistake; a still more serious delusion, to see here folk poetry where all is art" (p. 7). Wilamowitz is not of the school of Wolf, but rather of Hermann and his followers.

WILMANNS, W. Leben und Dichten Walthers von der Vogelweide. Bonn: 1882.

For the lyric development of the epic see especially the introduction. Students of the German epic should consult Wilmanns' other works; cf. below, § 12, XI, where may be found further references on the German court-epic.

WINDSCHEID, K. Die englische Hirtendichtung von 1579 bis 1625. Halle: 1895.

Original investigation; useful.

W. J. Preface to the English translation of Le Bossu. See under Le Bossu, § 8.

The latter half of this Preface gives several reasons why a successful epic poem cannot be written by a modern.

Wolf, F. A. Prolegomena ad Homerum, etc. 1st ed. Halle: 1795; 3d ed. 1884.

The "Homeric Question," the modern critical discussion of which was begun by this book, is made up of two chief problems: (1) How does it happen that these finished masterpieces stand at the beginning of Greek literature, with no ruder work behind them? (2) Both poems are artistic wholes, and yet each shows passages of inferior workmanship and contradictions in details. "How can we account at once for the general unity and for the particular discrepancies?" Wolf's answers to these questions are contained in the Prolegomena, and are summarized thus by Professor Jebb (Homer, 6th ed., Boston: 1904, pp. 108–109): "(1) The Homeric poems were composed without the aid of writing, which in 950 B.C. was either wholly unknown to the Greeks, or not yet employed by them for literary purposes. The poems were handed down by oral recitation, and in the course of that process suffered many alterations, deliberate or accidental, by the rhapsodes. (2) After the poems had been written down *circ.* 550 B.C., they suffered still further changes. These were deliberately made by 'revisers' (διασκευασταί), or by learned critics who aimed at polishing the work, and bringing it into harmony with certain forms of idiom or canons of art. (3) The Iliad has artistic unity; so, in a still higher degree, has the Odyssey. But this unity is not mainly due to the original poems; rather it has been superinduced by their artificial treatment in a later age. (4) The original poems, from which our Iliad and Odyssey have been put together, were not all by the same author." — Wolf was one of the first to point out the difference between the popular and the literary epic. He says: "Nondum enim prorsus eiecta et explosa est eorum ratio, qui Homerum et

Callimachum et Vergilium et Nonnum et Miltonum eodem animo legunt, nec, quid uniuscuiusque aetas ferat, expendere legendo et computare laborant" (3d ed., p. 33). — The remote predecessors of Wolf were of course the *Chorizontes*, or Alexandrian separatists (about 170 B.C.), with whose theories and those of Aristarchus (156 B.C.) who opposed them, and of the school of Aristarchus which was active till about A.D. 200, he became acquainted through the publication by Villoison of the Codex Venetus of the Iliad in 1788. This publication contained the Scholia Antiquissima ad Homeri Iliadem, and Wolf's Prolegomena was undertaken primarily to discuss the textual problems raised by the materials of the Scholia. In his *Lieder-Theorie* he had been anticipated, but without the adduction of substantial proofs, by Vico, D'Aubignac, Bishop Bentley, Blackwell (1735), Wood (Essay on the Original Genius of Homer, 1769), Heyne, and others (see § 9, VIII, B, 6).

WOLFF, E.
See above, § 5.

WOLFF, E. Prolegomena der litterar-evolutionistischen Poetik.
See above, § 8.

A criticism of the natural-science method of Scherer's Poetik, in the course of which it is asserted that the earliest poetry is always of an epic character, that "die starre Objectivität der ältesten Epik allmählich durch individuell-lyrische Empfindungen erweicht und durchbrochen wird" (p. 9). Pp. 13–14 give a brief outline of the development of German epic from objective to subjective forms. Wolff's point of view is aesthetic; it should be tested by the ethnological material at hand. Compare, by the same author, Vorstudien zur Poetik (*Zeitschrift f. vgl. Litt.*, 6: 425).

WOOD, R. An Essay on the Original Genius and Writings of Homer. Privately printed, 1769. 2d ed. 1775.

As a part of the return-to-nature reaction of the close of the too artificial 18th century there developed an appreciation of early popular poetry and an attempt to regard the Homeric epics as a product of ancient minstrelsy. Already Blackwell (1735, see above) had written upon the 'naturalness' of Homer. Wood endeavored to show that Homer composed orally, in the fashion of a bard, without the aid of writing. (For earlier debate on this question see Finsler, p. 211.) His arguments are based upon ancient authorities and upon the supposed parallel of Ossian, which had lately inflamed the 'nature-lovers' of the new movement. These works of Blackwell and Wood were translated into German, and they aroused much discussion, preparing the way for Wolf's Prolegomena. — On the question of whether writing was known in the time of Homer, see Art. Homer, Encyc. Brit.; on Minoan writing, anterior to the Homeric Age, see Art. Crete, Archaeology, Encyc. Brit.

SECTION 12. HISTORICAL STUDY BY NATIONALITIES: SPECIAL REFERENCES

NOTE. *For general apparatus for the historical study of the various national literatures, see above,* § 6, *and the list of literary histories given in the Appendix. The student who is concerned with any division of this section should be sure to refer at once to the general bibliography in the corresponding division of* § 6. *If, for instance, he is dealing with the medieval French epic* (V, A–D, *below*), *he should consult the bibliographical notes under the medieval French lyric* (§ 6, VII, B–F).

I. The Homeric Epics.

The best brief introductions to the study of the Homeric poems and the "Homeric Question" are G. Finsler's Die homerische Dichtung (Teubner, Leipz.: 1915), L. Laurand's Manuel des études grecques et latines, Fasc. II, Litt. grecque (Paris: 1914; see §§ 53–62 for a summary of arguments), Whibley's Companion to Greek Studies (Cambridge: 1905), H. Browne's Handbook of Homeric Study, though it is somewhat one-sided on the Homeric question (2d ed., 1910?), and R. C. Jebb's Homer (6th ed. Boston: 1904). The student cannot afford to neglect these methodical and, in the main, reliable guides. For the history of the philology that has concerned itself with the poems, see J. E. Sandys, A History of Classical Scholarship (3 vols. Cambridge: 1903–08), a chapter by the same author in Whibley's Companion to Greek Studies, and the references on p. 651 of Whibley's work; also Sandys' article, Classics, in the Encyc. Brit., 11th ed.

A. *The Homeric Question* (for other references to this topic see above, § 9, VIII, B, 6; § 10, I, B, 1; § 11, under Wolf). The chief problem of Homeric criticism, and the one most important for the literary student, concerns the composition of the poems. The authorship of the two poems was traditionally assigned to 'Homer,' and it had always been generally supposed that Homer had originated the poems much as any author nowadays would compose a poem on an historical subject. To be sure, there had been some objections to this tradition. In antiquity the story of the redaction or collection of Pisistratus had suggested to scholars the possible existence of pre-Homeric lays, and in Alexandrian criticism Xeno and Hellanicus (known as the *Chorizontes*, or 'separators') had cast doubt on the single authorship of the two poems. These ancient doubters were cited many a time between 1500 and 1795; for instance, by Camerarius 1538, Eobanus Hessus 1540, Scaliger 1561, Paoli Beni 1607, Isaac Casaubon, Johannes Meursius 1623, Salmasius 1629, J. Perizonius 1684, J. R. Wetstein 1684, D. G. Morhof 1688, Ludolph Küster 1696, Gronovius 1702, J. A. Fabricius (collection of all ancient *loci* on Homer, in his Bibliotheca Graeca 1705–1728), Richard Bentley 1713, and Rapin. Perrault, 1692, engaging in the quarrel of the ancients and moderns, had called attention afresh to the ancient *loci*; Abbé d'Aubignac, 1715, had suggested that the Iliad was derived from lays composed shortly after the Trojan war, which later were collected in rough fashion and, still later, into the more perfect form of the present poem. But these exceptions to the general belief had not stirred up a great deal of discussion. The critics and mankind generally thought of Homer as of any other great historian-poet.

References. For the Pisistratus fable and the notices of Cicero, Aelian, Plutarch, Suidas, Josephus, *et al.* concerning the authorship of the Homeric poems, see Finsler, Homer in der Neuzeit 202–203, 482; and for a fuller account, J. A. Fabricius, as cited above. On the *Chorizontes* see Whibley and p. 87 of Browne's work. For the modern citations of the ancient *loci* see Finsler 203–207, 482. Perrault's 'denial' of Homer is in the 4th dialogue (1692) of his Parallèle des anciens et des modernes; Abbé d'Aubignac's Conjectures académiques ou dissertation sur l'Iliade was published anonymously, 1715.

But toward the close of the 18th century the reaction against neo-classical formalism was responsible for a new conception. "In this movement the leading ideas were concentrated in the word Nature. The natural condition of society, natural law, natural religion, the poetry of nature, gained a singular foothold, first on the English philosophers from Hume onwards, and then (through Rousseau chiefly) on the general drift of thought and action in Europe. In literature the effect of these ideas was to set up a false opposition between nature and art. As political writers imagined a patriarchal innocence prior to codes of law, so men of letters sought in popular, unwritten poetry the freshness and simplicity which were wanting in the prevailing styles. The blind minstrel was the counterpart of the noble savage. The supposed discovery of the poems of Ossian fell in with this strain of sentiment, and created an enthusiasm for the study of early popular poetry. Homer was soon drawn into the circle of inquiry." The ancient doubts and modern repetitions of them had prepared the way; Vico, Blackwell, Herder, Wood (see above, § 11), D'Aubignac, and Heyne (see above, § 9) had reinvigorated the ancient suggestions with modern critical and historical methods. The recent discovery of a completely annotated manuscript of the Iliad (Codex Venetus 454, ed. Villoison, 1788) had renewed the interest in Homer. "Everything in short was ripe for the reception of a book that brought together, with masterly ease and vigour, the old and the new Homeric learning, and drew from it the historical proof that Homer was no single poet, writing according to art and rule, but a name which stood for a golden age of the true spontaneous poetry of genius and nature" (Art. Classics, Encyc. Brit.).

This book was F. A. Wolf's Prolegomena ad Homerum, etc. (1795), which has already been described (see above, § 11). With this work began an emphatic attempt to show that the poems are not the work of one man, but that they are composed of many anonymous lays of great age that have been added together to produce long poems. In other words, the adherents of this theory (the *Lieder-Theorie*) suppose that 'Homer' was either one minstrel or several minstrels, who put together, with little change, old traditional songs and ballads, using the popular materials of these songs in the composite, reproductive fashion of minstrels, not as a modern original poet — say Tennyson — would use the sources for an historical poem. This theory has been pushed to an absurd extreme. German critics in particular have attempted to divide, subdivide, and resubdivide the Iliad and Odyssey into original, separate songs and fragments of songs, until the poems appear like the ingenious exercises of a Bedlamite. These critics explain every slight difficulty of the text and many imaginary ones by supposing that a union of different songs without a pruning of their discrepancies reveals itself in the difficulty. Not so much to Wolf himself, but to his follower Lachmann and to Lachmann's followers, must the absurdities of this method of criticism be charged. See further on these theories in § 10, I, B.

Out of the method, however, one great, positive result has developed, — the change of the point of view of criticism from the *a priori* and 'rule-giving' to the historical. Modern scholars recognize that in the Homeric epics, as in other natural epics, the final form is the culmination of the songs of many centuries, and that these songs were gathered in cycles dealing with the national heroes. According to some a 'Homer' was the genius who shaped or poetized one or more of these cycles, deriving not so much from the material as from the inspiration of the earlier songs. From these song-aggregates or individual poetic cores it is another step to the finished epic, — a step that consists of the artistic welding and, in large degree, retelling of the stories of the cycles. This step usually is taken by some one or two or three great poets at a time when the conditions of anonymous, communal authorship are giving way to a higher and more self-conscious narrative art. According to some, this is where the 'Homer' first appears. As the opponents of the *Lieder-Theorie* have shown (see Lang, above, § 11), the art of the Homeric poems is not that of a minstrel-cycle.

The student will find summaries of the discussion of the nature and growth of the Homeric poems, or the 'Homeric Question,' as the discussion has come to be known, in the works of Whibley, Browne, and Jebb already mentioned, and in D. B. Monro's article in the Encyclopaedia Britannica. See also A. Shewan, Recent Homeric Literature (in *Classical Philology*, 7 : 190. 1912).

References. The following list of the chief works contributing to the discussion may prove helpful: L. Adam, Der Aufbau der Odyssee durch Homer, den ersten Rhapsoden und tragischen Dichter (Wiesbaden: 1911), — not a strong work; V. Bérard (cited below, under B), — the first twelve books of the Odyssey an adaptation of a Phoenician story, the last twelve belonging to another poem; T. Bergk, Griechische Litteraturgeschichte (vol. I. Berlin: 1872); G. Bernhardy, Grundriss der griechischen Litteratur, etc. (3d ed., vol. II, Pt. I. Halle: 1877); G. Bertrin, La question homérique (Paris: 1898); T. Blackwell (see above, § 11); F. Blass, Die Interpolationen in der Odyssee, a late and admirable defense of the unity of the Homeric poems (Halle: 1904); H. Bonitz, The Origin of the Homeric Poems, — directed against the unity of authorship (1860. English translation by L. R. Packard. N.Y.: 1880); A. Bougot, Étude sur l'Iliade d'Homère, an important work (Paris: 1888); M. Bréal, Pour mieux connaître Homère (Paris: 1906); H. Browne, Handbook of Homeric Study, — see p. 168 for Browne's own *via media* in the discussion (Lond.: 1905); P. Cauer, Grundfragen der Homerkritik, an attempt to discover the relative age of parts of the poems by the application of archaeological tests, — a method at present very popular (2d ed. 1909); M. Cesarotti, Prose edite e inedite, ed., G. Mazzoni (Bologna: 1882), p. 395 Letter to Wolf, p. 183 Digression on the Prolegomena — cf. Finsler, Homer in der Neuzeit, p. 465; W. Christ, Iliad (München: 1884; see the Prolegomena), and Homer und die Homeriden (München: 1884. 2d ed. 1885): Christ adheres to the theory of an original kernel of the poem that dealt with the story of Achilles alone (the Achilleid theory; see Grote, § 11), but modifies it by finding in this Achilleid a collection of popular lays rather than a carefully organized, artistic poem: he is followed by Croiset in his Hist. de la litt. grecque, vol. I, Chap. IV (1890); E. Drerup, Die Anfänge der hellenischen Kultur, Homer (München: 1903; Italian translation, with additions, 1910), — a separatist work; by the same, Das fünfte Buch der Ilias, Grundlagen einer homerischen Poetik (Paderborn: 1913); L. Erhardt, Die Entstehung der homerischen Gedichte (Leipz.: 1894); A. Fick, on the theory of Aeolic origin, — see his Odyssey (1883) and Iliad (1st half, 1885); Friedländer, Die homerische Kritik von Wolf bis Grote (Berlin: 1853); W. Geddes, The Problem of the Homeric Poems (Lond.: 1878), — a strong and ingenious argument in support of Grote's conclusions; A. van Gennep, La question d'Homère (Paris: 1909), — against the separatists; W. E. Gladstone, Studies on Homer and the Homeric Age (3 vols. Oxford: 1858); G. Grote, History of Greece, Part I, Chap. XXI (vol. II, p. 160. 1st ed. Lond.: 1848; see also Part I, Chap. XVII, for a comparison of Greek and Teutonic myths), — for Grote's theory of an Achilleid see above, § 11; J. G. J. Hermann, Dissertatio de Interpolationibus Homeri (1832. In Opusc. V, 52. Leipz.: 1834; and *ibid.*, VI, Pt. I, p. 70, and VIII, 11), — an early modifier and harmonizer of the views of Wolf and his opponent, Nitzsch; O. Immisch, Die innere Entwicklung des griechischen Epos (Leipz.: 1904); R. C. Jebb, in the work already mentioned, is in substantial agreement with Leaf (see below); E. Kammer, Zur homerischen Frage (Königsberg: 1870), and Die Einheit der Odyssee (Leipz.: 1873); A. Kirchhoff, Die Composition der Odyssee (Berlin: 1869), and his edition of the Odyssey (Berlin: 1859; 2d ed. 1879), — the first to make a thorough application of the Wolfian hypothesis to the Odyssey; H. A. T. Köchly, Iliadis Carmina XVI Restituta (Turin: 1861), — Wolfian; R. von Kralik, Homeros. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte und Theorie des Epos (Ravensburg: 1910), — unscientific; K. Lachmann, Betrachtungen über Homers Ilias, — one of the chief works of the separatists and in large part responsible for the extremes to which their theory has been carried (two papers, 1837, 1841; 3d ed. Berlin: 1874; see also Lachmann's similar work on the Nibelungenlied, cited below, XI, C; Lachmann's work on Homer is cited also in § 11); A. Lang, Homer and the Epic, where the student will find a *résumé* (Chapter II) of the doctrines of the forerunners of Wolf, and several chapters (III–V) devoted to a summary and criticism of Wolf's theory (for this and other works by Lang see above, § 11); G. Lange, Versuch die poetische Einheit der Ilias zu bestimmen (Darmstadt: 1826), an attempt to show that the contradictions of the poems were due to the nature of naïve creative genius; J. F. Lauer, Litterarischer Nachlass, Gesch. der homerischen Poesie (Berlin: 1851); L. Laurand, A propos d'Homère, progrès de la critique (Paris: 1913); W. Leaf (see above, § 11), — a detailed separation of the Iliad into its supposed parts, accepting the Achilleid theory with modifications; J. van Leeuwen, Commentationes Homericae (Leyden: 1911), — a converted separatist; F. Lillge, Komposition und poetische Technik der Διομήδους ’Αριστεία. Ein Beitrag zum Verständnis des homerischen Stiles (Gotha: 1911); J. W. Mackail, Lectures on Greek Poetry (Lond.: 1910); D. B. Monro, Homer's Odyssey (Oxford: 1901), — defending the unity of the poem; D. Mülder, Die Ilias und ihre Quellen (Berlin: 1910), — the Iliad the work of one poet; W. Müller, Homerische Vorschule (2d ed. Leipz.: 1836), a popularization of Wolf; W. Mure, A Critical History of the Language and Literature of Ancient Greece (2d ed. Lond.: 1854; see vol. I, and II, Bk. II, Chaps. II–XVII); G. Murray, The Rise of the Greek Epic (Oxford: 1907; 2d ed. 1911), — insists upon the existence of a 'traditional book,' — also the same author's Ancient Greek Literature, mentioned in the Appendix; B. Niese, Die Entwicklung der hom. Poesie (Berlin: 1882), and Der hom. Schiffskatalog, etc., on the spurious character of the Catalogue (Kiel: 1873; cf. T. W. Allen, in the *Classical Review*, 20: 193 ff.); G. W. Nitzsch, Beiträge zur Geschichte der epischen Poesie der Griechen (Leipz.: 1862), — see above, § 11; by the same, a commentary on the Odyssey, Bks. I–XII (Hannover: 1826–1840), and De Historia Homeri, etc. (Hannover: 1830–1837); but his chief work is the Sagenpoesie der Griechen (1852): in the words of Jebb, Nitzsch was responsible for "the first effective reaction against the Wolfian theory"; H. F. F. Nutzhorn, Die Entstehungsweise der hom. Gedichte (Leipz.: 1869); F. A. Paley, Iliad (2 vols. Lond.: 1866 ff.; see vol. I, pp. xi–li, and II, v–lviii), — "Paley's Paradox" was a contention that the mass of mythological lays concerned with the Trojan war was not edited in the present form of the epics until after the beginning of the fourth century B.C.; C. Robert, Studien zur Ilias, an attempt to distinguish strata of composition in the Iliad by the combined application of archaeological and philological tests (Berlin: 1901); C. Rothe, Die Ilias als Dichtung (Paderborn: 1910), — contradictions and differences in diction not an argument against unity of authorship, as witness poems whose authors are known; O. Seeck, Die Quellen der Odyssee (Berlin: 1887); K. Sittl, Die Wiederholungen in der Odyssee (München: 1882); A. Smyth, Composition of the Iliad (Lond.: 1914), — directed against the separatists; F. M. Stawell, Homer and the Iliad (Lond.: 1909), — a core with later additions; H. Steinthal, Ueber Homer und insbesondere die Odyssee (in *Zeitschr. für Vps.*, 7: 1–88); V. Terret, Homère. Étude historique et critique, an attempt to defend the unity of authorship (Paris: 1899); J. A. K. Thomson, Studies in the Odyssey (Oxford: 1914); G. Vico (see above,

§ 11); R. Volkmann, Geschichte und Kritik der Wolfschen Prolegomena zu Homer (Leipz.: 1874); F. G. Welcker, Der epische Cyclus (very important: see above, § 11); U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, Homerische Untersuchungen (I Die Composition der Odyssee. II Homerische Vorfragen. Berlin: 1884; see above, § 11); F. A. Wolf, the originator of the modern Homeric question (see above, § 11; cf. J. D. Gürtler, below, III, C); R. Wood (see below, and above, § 11). For the attitude of Goethe, Schiller, Wieland, and Friedrich and A. W. Schlegel toward the separatist theory, see Finsler, Homer in der Neuzeit, 465–472. For the general histories of Greek literature see below, Appendix: consult especially Bergk, Bernhardy, K. O. Müller, and Ulrici. For linguistic testimony see the writings of T. W. Allen; also the Appendixes to Miss Stawell's Homer and the Iliad (1909); two articles by Professor J. A. Scott (*Classical Philol.*, 5: 41; *Classical Review*, 24: 8); and many of the works already cited.

B. *The Homeric Age.* The development of epic literatures is so intimately related to political and social conditions that the study of those conditions constitutes one of the most successful approaches to the understanding of the character and evolution of the epic. The student will map out the successive social and political changes that have attended the development of a particular epic literature. He will note, for instance, the conditions under which the epic lays first originate; the changed conditions under which these lays are sung by the courtly bards of a later, and often other, civilization; he will observe how the original scale of the poems is widened under the new conditions, how the story of a small barbarian chieftain may become the story of a conqueror of a nation, and how the insignificant band of the chieftain's retainers may swell to an army of myriads. With the results of one such study in mind, he will pass to a comparative study of the political and social presuppositions of other epic literatures; and from the basic results he may, if dauntless, endeavor to draw up a typical account of the development of epic materials from their beginnings to their culmination in an Iliad, a Chanson de Roland, or a Nibelungenlied. Compare above, § 10, II. This typical development, if it can once be established, will indicate the law of epic evolution. For the investigation of the Homeric field from this point of view the following list of works, most of them concerned with archaeological, social, political, and economic backgrounds, will be helpful. Special attention should be paid to the great pre-Homeric Minoan culture, recently revealed by excavations in Crete, for this long-buried civilization throws much light on the provenience of the Homeric Achaeans. Nor should the student forget that all the older treatises (before 1900) on early Greek culture must be rewritten in the light of this new knowledge. — References on the relation between Greek and Germanic epic-backgrounds are appended to the notes on the Nibelungenlied (p. 754, below).

References. I. Bekker, Homerische Blätter (Bonn: 1872); E. Belzner, Homerische Probleme. I Die kulturellen Verhältnisse der Odyssee als kritische Instanz (Leipz.: 1911); V. Bérard, Les Phéniciens et l'Odyssée (2 vols. Paris: 1902–03; cf. P. Champault, Phéniciens et Grecs en Italie d'après l'Odyssée. Paris: 1906); A. Biese, Die Entwicklung des Naturgefühls bei den Griechen (Kiel: 1882; cf. W. P. Begg, Development of Taste, Chap. III; also, H. Motz, Ueber die Empfindung der Naturschönheit bei den Alten. Leipz.: 1865); J. S. Blackie, Homer and the Iliad (1866), and On the Theology of Homer (in Horae Hellenicae etc. Lond.: 1874); P. Bohse, Die Moira bei Homer (Berlin: 1893); E. Burnouf, Otfried Muller et les origines de la poésie hellénique (in *Rev. des Deux Mondes*, Oct. 1, 1866); H. von Brunn, Die Kunst bei Homer (München: 1868); E. Buchholz, Die homerischen Realien (Leipz.: 1871–75; I Welt und Natur; II Oeffentliches und privates Leben; III Götterlehre, Psychologie, Ethik); S. Butler, The Authoress of the Odyssey (Lond.: 1897); L. Campbell, Religion in Greek Literature (see above, § 8); P. Cauer, Grundfragen der Homerkritik (Leipz.: 1895; 2d ed. 1909); H. M. Chadwick, The Heroic Age, — very important (see above, § 11); A. Clerke, Familiar Studies in Homer (Lond.: 1892); W. Dörpfeld, Troja und Ilion (2 vols. Athens: 1902); E. Drerup, as cited above, under A; L. Dyer, Studies of the Gods in Greece (Lond.: 1891); Sir A. J. Evans, The Nine Minoan Periods, a summary sketch of the characteristic stages of Cretan civilization, from the close of the neolithic to the beginning of the iron age (Lond.: 1914), — also Art. Crete, Archaeology, in Encyc. Brit., and references given there to other articles by Evans; L. R. Farnell, The Cults of the Greek States (5 vols.

Oxford: 1896–1909); P. Gardner, New Chapters in Greek History (Lond.: 1892), Chap. V Recent Discoveries and the Homeric Poems; by the same, The Principles of Greek Art (N.Y.: 1914), Chap. XVI, on relation of painting and epic poetry; W. E. Gladstone (see above, § 8); H. R. Hall, The Oldest Civilization of Greece (Lond.: 1901); by the same, Aegean Archaeology (Lond. and N.Y.: 1915); Miss J. E. Harrison, The Myths of the Odyssey (Lond.: 1882); W. Helbig, Das homerische Epos aus den Denkmälern erläutert (2d ed. Leipz.: 1887); D. G. Hogarth, Ionia and the East (Oxford: 1909); and the Art. Aegean Civilization, in Encyc. Brit., which gives further references; R. C. Jebb, Homeric and Hellenic Ilium (in *Jour. Hel. Studies*, II, 7), and Homeric Troy (in *Fortn. Rev.*, N.S. XXXV, 433); Arbois de Jubainville, La civilisation des Celtes et celle de l'épopée homérique (being vol. II of the Cours de littérature celtique. 1899); H. Jordan, Der Erzählungsstil in den Kampfscenen der Ilias (Breslau: 1905); E. Kammer, Ein ästhetischer Kommentar zu Homers Ilias (3d ed. Paderborn: 1906); A. G. Keller, Homeric Society (N.Y.: 1902); A. Lang (see above, § 11); W. C. Lawton, Art and Humanity in Homer (N.Y.: 1896); W. Leaf, Homer and History (Lond.: 1915); G. Murray (see above, § 11); J. L. Myres, The Dawn of History (Home Univ. Library, N.Y.: 1911), — most suggestive; C. F. von Nägelsbach, Homerische Theologie (3d ed. Nürnberg: 1884); W. C. Perry, The Women of Homer (N.Y.: 1898); E. Quinet, De l'histoire de la poésie (Œuvres complètes, vol. IX. Paris: n.d.; see also Bk. V of L'Esprit nouveau, in vol. XXVII); W. Reichel, Über homerische Waffen (Wien: 1894); W. Ridgeway, The Early Age of Greece (Cambridge: 1901); C. Robert, Studien zur Ilias (Berlin: 1901), and Topographische Probleme der Ilias (in *Hermes*, 42: 78–112. 1907); H. Schliemann, Ithaka, der Peloponnes, und Troja (Leipz.: 1869), Trojanische Alterthümer (Leipz.: 1874), Ilios (N.Y.: 1881), Troja (N.Y.: 1884), and Tiryns (N.Y.: 1885); C. Schuchhardt, Schliemann's Excavations, a convenient epitome of Schliemann's massive and confusing volumes (trans. from the German by Eugénie Sellers. Lond.: 1891); T. D. Seymour (see above, § 11); T. T. Timayenis, Greece in the Times of Homer (N.Y.: 1885); J. A. K. Thompson, Studies in the Odyssey (Oxford Press: 1914); C. Tsountas and J. I. Manatt, The Mycenaean Age (Boston: 1897), 2d ed. (1914), with new chapters on pre-Mycenaean archaeology and Crete; W. S. Tyler, The Theology of the Greek Poets (Boston: 1867); W. F. Warren, Homer's Abode of the Dead (Boston: 1883), and Homer's Abode of the Living (Boston: 1885); E. Weissenborn, Leben und Sitte bei Homer (Leipz.: 1901; trans. by G. C. Scoggin and C. G. Burkitt, Weissenborn's Homeric Life. N.Y.: 1903); R. Wood, An Essay on the Original Genius and Writings of Homer, etc. (Dublin: 1775; trans. into German, Frankfurt: 1773, from an earlier, privately printed English edition, 1769, that was without the appendix describing the Troad), — the first book seriously to raise the question whether the composer of the Homeric poems used the art of writing, and in this respect a forerunner of Wolf's Prolegomena (cf. Blackwell, above, § 11, and see Jebb's Homer, Boston: 1904, pp. 105, 107).

Texts and Commentaries. The *chief editions* of the Greek texts are as follows: Editio princeps, Demetrius Chalcondylas (Florence: 1488); the Codex Venetus or Venetus A, Villoison (Venice: 1788); Wolf, Iliad (Halle: 1794), and Iliad and Odyssey (4 vols. Leipz.: 1804+); Heyne, Iliad (Leipz.: 1802+); Dindorf and Franke (Leipz.: 1826+); Bekker (2 vols. Bonn: 1858); Kirchhoff, Odyssey (Berlin: 1859. 2d ed. 1879); Nauck (Berlin: 1874+); Hentze, for Teubner (1883); Christ, Iliad (München: 1884); D. B. Monro and T. W. Allen (Oxford: 1902–12). Most convenient for English-speaking students are the annotated editions of Merry and Riddell (Od. I–XII), Monro (Od. XIII–XXIV), Leaf (Il.), Ameis and Hentze (Il. and Od.).

The great *commentary* of Eustathius, Archbishop of Thessalonica in the latter half of the twelfth century, contains a vast number of excerpts from earlier writers concerning the language and matter of the poems: editio princeps (Rome: 1542+); ed. by G. Stallbaum (Leipz.: 1825+). — The *Scholia*, or explanatory notes of early grammarians, have been edited by W. Dindorf and E. Maas (Il. Oxford: 1875+; Od. Oxford: 1855). — For *concordances* see Seber's Index Homericus (Oxford: 1780), Prendergast's concordance to the Iliad (Lond.: 1875), and Dunbar's to the Odyssey (Oxford: 1880), Ebeling's Lexicon Homericum (1874–85), and Gehring's Index Homericus (1891).

English Translations. Verse translations of the Iliad by Chapman (1598–1611), Pope (1715), Cowper (1791), W. Munford (1846), F. W. Newman (1856), Lord Derby (1864), Worsley and Connington, who used the Spenserian stanza (1865), W. C. Bryant (1870), C. B. Cayley (1877), and partial translations by Way, Cummings, etc., etc. The best translation into English prose, and at the same time the best translation for the use of the English student who cannot read the original, is that of Lang, Leaf, and Myers. The translation of the Iliad in Bohn's Library by E. H. Blakeney (Lond.: 1909) is also usable. Verse translations of the Odyssey by Chapman (1614–15), Pope (1725), Worsley (1861), W. C. Bryant (1871), Schomberg (1879), William Morris (1887), Way (3d ed. 1904), and J. W. Mackail (3 vols. Lond.: 1903–10). Those by Morris and Mackail are the best for the use of the student; but the prose translations by Butcher and Lang, and by Palmer, are better still. The student will be interested in Matthew Arnold's essays On Translating Homer, and in Newman's reply, for both of which see above, under Arnold, § 8.

For French, Italian, and German translations see Finsler as noted above, § 8.

II. Other Greek Epics.

A. On *Hesiod's* works, and their relation to an ancient peasant poetry, see the histories of Greek literature cited in the Appendix.

B. On the so-called *Cyclic Poets* (authors of epic poems on the Trojan war and the war against Thebes, of whose works only a few fragments remain, and whose age extended from the 8th to the 6th century B.C.), see the histories of Greek literature. For the original information concerning the epic cycle, consult the prose summaries in the Chrestomathia of Eutychius Proclus, which may be found in Cod. 239 of Migne's edition of the Bibliotheca of Photius; the fragments have been edited by H. Düntzer (Köln: 1840) and by G. Kinkel (for Teubner, Leipz.: 1877); Welcker's work (cited above, § 11) is the chief treatise of historical and critical nature upon these poets; a long discussion will be found in Chap. XXI of Grote's History; Lange's Ueber die kyklischen Dichter (Mainz: 1837) is representative of scholarship in its time, as is Wilamowitz-Moellendorff's Der epische Cyclus (Homerische Untersuchungen. Berlin: 1884) of scholarship to-day. T. W. Allen gives a summary of sources and authorities in his The Epic Cycle (*Classical Quarterly*, Jan. and April, 1908). See also D. B. Monro (*Journal of Hellenic Studies*, IV. 1883) and appendix to his ed. of the Odyssey XIII–XXIV (1900); E. Bethe, Thebanische Heldenlieder (Leipz.: 1891); J. E. Sandys, Hist. of Class. Schol., vol. I, Chap. II (2d ed. 1906); J. B. Bury, Ancient Greek Historians, pp. 2–8 (1909); articles in Ersch and Gruber's Allgemeine Encyklopädie and in Pauly-Wissowa's Real-Encyclopädie. Among the poems were the Cypria, Aethiopis, The Sack of Troy, The Little Iliad, Nostoi (Homeward Voyages), Telegonia, Thebais, Epigoni.

C. The *Alexandrian Epic* is typified by the Argonautica of Apollonius of Rhodes (194 B.C.), the relations of which to the earlier Homeric epics, on the one hand, and to the later Aeneid, on the other hand, are of peculiar importance to the student of literary imitations. Apollonius, of course, drew very largely from Homer; and very large was Virgil's debt to Apollonius. The different cultural backgrounds of the ages of 'Homer,' Apollonius, and Virgil afford contrasts that explain in great part the varying nature of the three poems. In the comparative study of the Argonautica, therefore, lies an opportunity for furthering our systematic knowledge of the evolution of the epic; and the paucity of criticism upon Apollonius makes the opportunity all the more alluring. The following topics may prove suggestive: Apollonius more of an historian and antiquarian than a bard, and the consequent lack of simplicity and ease of movement in his poem (contrast the indigenous folk epic); the Argonautica as an example of an Alexandrian *fin de siècle* return-to-nature movement (cf. Theocritus and contemporary sculpture) sentimentalizing the heroic age; the self-consciousness of the poet, and at the same time his industry of detail — as of an historian; the attitude toward the marvellous as distinguishing the literary from the so-called folk epic — full belief in the latter, apology or thinly veiled scepticism, or willing suspension of disbelief, in the former; the realism of the marvellous in Homer, the fancifulness in Apollonius; the subordination of the wonderful to heroic action in the Iliad, the fairy-tale elaboration of the marvellous in the Argonautica; the less imaginative and noble, but more fanciful, attitude of the Argonautica toward the gods; its development of a romantic, unheroic interest (Medea-Jason), with subjective description of a woman's love moods (cf. the position of woman in the luxurious Alexandria of Apollonius' time); the extent to which Apollonius follows Homer in plot, characterization, development of situation, diction, etc.; the quality, method, and extent of his variation from Homer in these respects. What generalization can be made as to the sort of details copied from Homer, the methods of copying them, and the manner of variation from Homer? In other words, what principles of imitation and variation can be discovered? Cf. above, § 10, IV. Do these principles hold for the Aeneid? for other literary epics that derive from previous folk epics? from previous literary epics?

The Teubner edition is by R. Merkel (Leipz.: 1852). Wellauer's edition contains the Scholia (2 vols. Leipz.: 1828). Beck's edition (Leipz.: 1797), which is incomplete, contains a translation into Latin. G. W. Mooney's edition (Lond.: 1912) has a valuable introduction. Of translations into English that of Fawkes will be found in Chalmers' English Poets, vol. XX (1810); that of Way was published 1901. The Bohn translation (in prose) is by E. P. Coleridge (Lond.: 1889). There is a French translation by H. de la Ville de Mirmont (Bordeaux: 1892), and the same author has published an essay of some comparative value under the title Apollonios de Rhodes et Virgile, etc. (Paris: 1894). On the same subject see also R. Heinze, Virgils epische Technik (1903). A. Couat's La poésie alexandrine contains material on the poem and its author. See also G. W. Elderkin, Aspects of the Speech in the Later Greek Epic (Baltimore: 1906. Diss.); J. W. Mackail, Lectures on Greek Poetry (Lond.: 1910); Susemihl, Gesch. d. griech. Lit. in d. alexandrinischen Zeit.; Annales xxx de Bordeaux, I–XVI.

D. *Later Epics*. During the first centuries of the Christian era a few curious epics were written in Greek. The Τὰ μεθ' Ὅμηρον of Quintus Smyrnaeus (4th cent.?) has been edited by Köchly (Leipz.: 1850); by A. S. Way, with verse translation (Lond.: 1903). See Sainte-Beuve's Études sur Virgile suivies d'une étude sur Quintus Smyrnaeus (Paris: 1857); G. W. Paschal, A Study of Q. Smyrnaeus (Chicago: 1904); Kehmptgow, De Q. Smyrnaei Fontibus ac Mythopoiia (Kiel: 1891); F. A. Paley, Q. S. and the 'Homer' of the Tragic Poets (1879); also articles by Z. Zimmermann (see his ed., Teubner, 1891). Scaliger preferred the Dionysiaca of Nonnus (possibly toward the end of the fourth century) to Homer, but it was not so highly regarded by Heinsius and Rapin. It has been edited by Graefe (2 vols. Leipz.: 1819–1826), and by Marcellus, with a French prose translation (1856); see Ouwaroff, Nonnus von Panopolis, etc. (Petersb.: 1817); R. Köhler, Über die Dionysiaka des Nonnus (1853); I. Negrisoli, Studio critico . . . Nonnus (1903); Baumgartner, IV, pp. 69–77. Tryphiodorus (about the fifth century) wrote several epics, of which only The Destruction of Troy remains (ed. Wernicke. Leipz.: 1819). Of the epics of Coluthus (about the beginning of the sixth century) we have left the Rape of Helen (ed. Bekker. Berlin: 1816; English trans. by Fawkes, in Chalmers' English Poets, vol. XX). The Hero and Leander of Musaeus (perhaps of the fifth century, but a great variety of opinion on the matter) is edited by Dilthey (Bonn: 1874; translated into English by Fawkes, Chalmers' Eng. Poets, XX); see Schwabe, De Musaeo Nonni Imitatore (Tubing.: 1876). On all of these writers see Baumgartner, vol. IV.

E. For *Byzantine* (527–1453) epic poetry see Krumbacher (cited in Appendix), pp. 641–643, 824–884. Full bibliographies accompany the account.

III. **Roman Epics.**

A. *Absence of a Popular Epic.* The student will be interested in trying to account for the absence of a popular epic in Roman literature. On a possible "chant populaire" among the Romans, see W. Y. Sellar, Roman Poets of the Republic, Chap. II. (3d ed. 1889); Quinet, Hist. de la poésie, Chaps. V, VI, and the first footnote in Chap. VI, where the following references for the same subject are given: Niebuhr's History of Rome, the examination of the subject by the Schlegel brothers, Lachmann's De Fontibus Historicis T. Livii (1822), Beck's Epicrisis Quaestionis de Hist. Rom., Petersen's De Originibus Hist. Rom. Dissertatio (1835), Wachsmuth's Hist. de l'état romain, Krause's Hist. Lat. (1835), and Blum (1828). Other material may be derived from later histories of Rome, such as Mommsen's, and from histories of Roman literature, such as Bernhardy's, Teuffel's, Schanz's, Sellar's, Ribbeck's, Wachsmuth's. See Appendix, below, and the articles in Pauly-Wissowa's Real-Encyclopädie d. class. Altertumswissenschaft (1894 +).

B. *Early Epics.* The student should regard the nature of certain epical literature preceding the Virgilian epic. The names of Livius

Andronicus, who translated the Odyssey, and of Naevius and Ennius indicate the field to be explored. Only fragments of this literature have survived. We also have notices of other epics of the Augustan Age, such as a poem on the Amazons by Domitius Marsus, a Sicilian War by Cornelius Severus, an Alexandrian War by Rabirius, and a Theseis by Pedo Albinovanus; and of epicists the titles of whose poems are lost, such as Ponticus, Macer, Sabinus. Then, too, there are the 'little epics' (*epyllia*) found in manuscripts of Virgil and attributed to him (Culex, Ciris, Moretum, etc.). See the literary histories; also O. Haube, Die Epen der römischen Lit. im Zeitalter der Republik (2 Pts. Schrimm: 1895–97; Progr.).

C. *Virgil's Aeneid.*

For Virgilian bibliography see the histories of Schanz and Teuffel (noted above, § 5), which also afford excellent introductions to the study of the Aeneid. Other introductions in Sellar's Roman Poets of the Augustan Age: Virgil (2d ed. 1883), Nettleship's Essays in Latin Lit. (1884), Tyrrell's Latin Poetry (1898), Patin's Essais sur la poésie latine (4th ed. 1900), J. W. Mackail's Latin Lit. (3d ed. 1899), and C. T. Cruttwell's Hist. of Rom. Lit. See also the works by Dryden, Glover, Green, Heinze, Keble, F. W. H. Myers, Plüss, Sainte-Beuve, and Shairp, noted above, § 8.

It may be of some aid to suggest here several of the more important critical problems presented in the study of the Aeneid. (*a*) The relation of the Aeneid to Homer and to Apollonius of Rhodes, already mentioned above. Many of the usual problems of Virgilian study, especially those involving the interpretation of the character of Aeneas, the justification of the Dido episode, the formality of style, etc., are illumined by noting the influence of Apollonius. Dido and Aeneas should be compared with their prototypes, the Medea and Jason of the Argonautica, if the student would fully understand the process of imitation by which the Virgilian characters came to be what they are. See an interesting and illuminating remark to this effect in Murray's Ancient

Greek Literature, p. 381. (*b*) The nature of the influences under which Virgil produced his epic: a problem typical in the genesis of the artificial national epic. The influence of social conditions is now a matter of literary truism; but Renaissance criticism was blind to the difference of circumstances under which the Iliad and the Aeneid were produced. On the other hand, it should be said, by way of caution, that the tendency of the post-Wolfian criticism of the epic has been to obscure the aristocratic and courtly surroundings of the poet who finally gave to the Iliad its artistic form. The Wolfian separatists have betrayed us into underrating the sophistication of the Homeric poet by focusing our attention on the possibility of separate lays of popular origin (cf. Bradley, as noted above, § 8). (*c*) The relation of the Aeneid to earlier versions of the wanderings of Aeneas. (*d*) The presence of meditative and philosophical elements in the poem: of importance in determining the character of the artificial epic. In what way do these elements differ from the occasional reflective notes of Homer? (*e*) The relation of the poem to the politics of Rome: an investigation of interest in itself, and as a basis for the comparative study of later artificial epics of national bearing. Of the possible political bearings of the Iliad we can only conjecture. There is no reason to suppose that there were no such bearings. (*f*) Similarly, the relation of the poem to the religion of Rome, and the indications of Virgil's own beliefs. (*g*) Green's study of the Aeneid (see above, § 8): excellent material for a careful critique. The poetic character of Green's critical insight and his splendid assurance of statement have endowed the Aeneid with a significance that must be both carefully and sympathetically weighed before one can arrive at any conclusion regarding the 'artificiality' of the poem. Sellar's work (mentioned in § 8) will afford a convenient check to the utterances of the more enthusiastic Green. Compare F. W. H. Myers' celebrated essay (also cited in § 8). (*h*) The imitations and adaptations of Ennius. (*i*) *Virgilius amantissimus vetustatis*: a study of the antiquarian enthusiasm of Virgil. (*j*) Special studies in the Virgilian influence on later Latin epics, on the epic poetry of the Middle Ages, or on individual European epics of later date.

References. The following works should be consulted by the student who wishes to inform himself of the nature of Virgilian criticism: S. Adriano, Il sentimento religioso nell' Eneide (Torino: 1898); A. Arndt, Homer und Vergil, eine Parallele (Leipz.: 1874); É. Bertrand, Virgile et Apollonius de Rhodes (*Ann. de l'univ. de Grenoble*, vol. 10. 1898); A. Biese, Die Entwicklung des Naturgefühls bei den Römern (Kiel: 1884), cf. Begg, Develpt. of Taste, Chap. IV; H. Belling, Studien über die Compositionskunst Vergils in der Aeneide (Leipz.: 1899); C. A. Bentfeld, Der Einfluss des Ennius auf Vergil (Progr., Salzb.: 1875); Boissier, La religion romaine d'Auguste aux Antonins (1884); Nouvelles promenades archéologiques, Horace et Virgile (6th ed., Paris: 1907); A. Bougot, De Morum Indole in Virgilii Aeneide (Paris: 1876); F. Cauer, De Fabulis Graecis ad Romam Conditam Pertinentibus (*Berl. Stud.*, 1: 451. 1884); Die röm. Aeneassage von Naevius bis Vergilius (*Fleckeis. Jahrb.*, *Supplementbd.* 15. 1887); Comparetti, Virgilio nel medio evo (1872), Eng. trans. by E. F. M. Benecke, Vergil in the Middle Ages (1895), — a standard work that traces the medieval legend of Virgil as a magician; C. Conrardy, De Vergilio Apollonii Rhodii Imitatore (Diss., Freib. i. Schw.: 1904); T. Creizenach, Die Aeneïs . . . im Mittelalter (Frankfurt: 1864); V. de Crescenzo, Studi sui fonti dell' Eneide (Torino: 1902); E. S. Duckett, Influence of Alexandrian Poetry upon the Aeneid (in *Classical Journal*, 11: 333. 1916); F. G. Eichhoff, Études grecques sur Virgile, — references to Greek originals (Paris: 1825); H. R. Fairclough, Influence of Greek and Roman Art on Vergil (*Proc. Am. Phil. Ass.*, 35: lxix. 1904); A. Förstemann, Zur Geschichte des Aeneasmythus (Magdeburg: 1894); F. P. Fulgentius, Expositio Virgilianae Continentiae secundum Philosophos Moralis, ed. R. Helm (Teubner, Leipz.: 1898), of great weight in the Middle Ages — it interpreted the Aeneid as an allegory of human life; S. A. Geike, The Love of Nature among the Romans during the later Decades of the Republic and the first Century of the Empire (1912; cf. K. Allen, The Treatment of Nature in the Poetry of the Roman Republic, Diss., Madison, Wisconsin: 1899); H. Georges, Die politische Tendenz der Aeneide (Progr., Stuttg.: 1880); A. Gercke, Die Entstehung der Aeneis (Berlin: 1913); Gibbon, Critical Observations on the 6th Book of the Aeneid (1770), — religion in Virgil; J. D. Gürtler and S. F. W. Hoffmann, Fr. Aug. Wolf's Vorlesungen über die Alterthumswissenschaft, Bd. III (Leipz.: 1839); J. Henry, Aeneidea, or Critical, Exegetical, and Aesthetical Remarks on the Aeneis (1873–79), — the author spent twenty years in reading as many as have survived of the works Virgil could have used, and in other laborious preparation for this interesting and valuable book; also Henry's Notes of Twelve Years' Voyage of Discovery in the First Six Books of the Aeneid (1853); C. G. Heyne, De Carmine Epico Verg.; J. A. Hild, La légende d'Énée avant Virgile (Paris: 1883); C. H. Kindermann, De Fabulis a Vergilio in Aen. Tractatis (Diss., Leiden: 1885); De Aeneassage en de Aeneis (Leiden: 1897); W. Kroll, Studien über die Composition der Aen. (*Fleckeis. Jahrb.*, *Supplementbd.* 27. 1902); A. Liverani, La Pietà di Enea (Torino: 1896); L. Magnier, Analyse critique et littéraire de l'Énéide (Paris: 1844); Morf, Notes pour servir à l'histoire de la légende de Troie en Italie (*Romania*, vols. 21, 24. 1892, 1895); E. Norden, Vergils Aeneis im Lichte ihrer Zeit (*Neue Jahrb. f. das klass. Altert.*, 1901, p. 249; cf. an article by the same author in *Hermes*, 28); B. L. D'Ooge, The Journey of Aeneas (*Class. Journ.*, vol. 4. 1908); G. Ponzian, In che Virgilio anco imitando Omero (Padova: 1875); E. K. Rand, Virgil and the Drama (*Class. Journ.*, vol. 4. 1908); P. Richter, De Virgilio Imitatore Poetarum Graecorum (Diss., Rostock: 1870); R. Ritter, Die Quellen Vergils für die Darstellung der Irrfahrten des Aeneas (Progr., Nordhausen: 1909); F. X. M. J. Roiron, Étude sur l'imagination auditive de Virgile (Diss., Paris: 1898); Schwegler, Römische Geschichte, vol. I (1853); M. S. Slaughter, Virgil, an Interpretation (in *Classical Journal*, 12: 359. 1917); Tissot, Études sur Virgile (Paris: 1825–30); J. Tollkiehn, Homer und die römische Poesie (Leipz.: 1900), — an admirable monograph; V. Ussani, In difesa di Enea (Roma: 1896); H. de la Ville de Mirmont, Apollonios de Rhodes et Virgile (Paris: 1894); F. M. A. de Voltaire, Dict. philosophique, Art. Épopée, — see the remarks on Virgil, — an example of the inability of the eighteenth century to appreciate the genius of Homer. Voltaire praises Virgil far above Homer because the Aeneid, especially the fourth book, "est rempli de vers touchans, qui font verser des larmes à ceux qui ont de l'oreille et du sentiment"; H. Wedewer, Homer, Virgil, Tasso (Münster: 1843); U. v. Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, Reden und Vorträge (Berlin: 1901), p. 265; N. W. De Witt, The Dido Episode in the Aeneid of Virgil (Chicago Diss., Toronto: 1907); Wörner, Die Sage von den Wanderungen des Aeneas (Leipz.: 1882). For a more complete and classified bibliography see Schanz.

Editions and Translations. Of the *editions* of the Latin text it is sufficient to mention those of Ribbeck (use the edition of 1894 +) and Hirtzel (Oxford Classics. 1900). Of annotated editions those of Papillon and Haigh (2 vols. Oxford) and Conington (completed by Nettleship) are useful. The great *commentaries* of Donatus and Servius belong to the end of the 4th century. There are many *translations*. See an essay in the *Quart. Rev.* (July, 1861), which deals especially with the older English translations, such as those of Phaer (of parts, 1558), Stanyhurst (of parts, 1582), Ogilby (1684), Dryden (1697), etc.; similar essays by Conington, Miscell. Works, vol. I, and Tyrrell, Latin Poetry, Appendix. The Earl of Surrey's translation of the second and fourth books belongs to the year 1557, Caxton's translation to 1490. Of recent translations see those of C. P. Cranch (Boston: 1824), Conington (Lond.: 1873), William Morris (1875), J. W. Mackail (1885), O. Crane (N.Y.: 1888), J. D. Long (Boston: 1900), C. J. Billson (1906), J. Rhoades (new ed., 1907), T. C. Williams (1908), J. Jackson (Oxford Lib. of Translations). The Bohn translation is by Davidson, the Globe by J. Lonsdale and S. Lee. Of the verse translations, those of Dryden and Morris are the best; of the prose, those of the Oxford Lib., Globe, and Bohn editions. — Of modern French translations, those of J. Delille and J. Michaud (2d ed. Paris: 1813–14), Desportes (1900), and Motteau (1901) may be mentioned. — The German translation of J. H. Voss was issued in 1822; see also the German versions by Neuffer (1816), Binder (1857), Zille (1863), and Hertzberg (1869), — the best. — Italian versions by A. Caro (1888) and Angelina (1899–1900).

D. *Epics of the Silver Age.* Here the student must consider the literary epics of Lucan (Pharsalia), Statius (Thebais, Achilleis), Valerius Flaccus (Argonautica), Silius Italicus (Punica).

Lucan's Pharsalia is typical. It has been edited by C. M. Francken, and by C. E. Haskin (Lond.: 1887). The Bohn translation is by H. T. Riley (Lond.: 1878). See R. Ackermann, Lucans Pharsalia in den Dichtungen Shelley's (Zweibrücken: 1896; Progr.); W. E. Heitland, the Introduction to Haskin's edition; F. Oettl, Lucans philosophische Weltanschauung (Brixen: 1888; Progr.); N. I. Singels, De Lucani Fontibus, etc. (Lugduni-Batavorum: 1884); M. Souriau, De Deorum Ministeriis in Pharsalia (Paris: 1885). See also the various literary histories, especially Cruttwell and Pinder.

Other references for these epics are: H. E. Butler, Post-Augustan Poetry; O. Haube, Die Epen des silbernen Zeitalters der römischen Litteratur (2 Pts. Fraustadt: 1886–87; Progr.); H. C. Lipscomb, Aspects of the Speech in the Later Roman Epic (Baltimore: 1907; Diss.); H. Patin, Études sur la poésie latine (2 vols. 3d ed. Paris: 1883; see vol. I, xi); Summers, A Study of the Argonautica of Valerius Flaccus (Camb.: 1894); Legras, Étude sur la Thébaïde de Stace (Paris: 1905); D. Nisard, Poètes latins de la Décadence (2 vols. 5th ed. Paris: 1882).

E. On *Claudian* (*ob. c.* 408), the last of the Roman poets, see the literary histories, the Arts. Claudian in the Encyc. Brit. and Pauly-Wissowa's Real-Encyclopädie, and T. Hodgkin, Claudian, the Last of the Roman Poets (1875).

IV. **Latin Christian Narrative Poetry** from the second century to the time of Dante.

NOTE. *Because many students of literature are but slightly familiar with the literature of this period, and because its relation to later literary development is of great importance, the following notes have been expanded out of proportion to the other divisions of this section.*

The most convenient English introduction to the Latin Christian literature of the first three centuries is G. Krüger's History of Early Christian Literature in the First Three Centuries (N.Y.: 1897; trans. by C. R. Gillett). It contains all the necessary critical paraphernalia, including classified bibliography. A. Harnack's Geschichte der altchristlichen Litteratur bis Eusebius (Leipz.: 1893) and Die Chronologie der altchristlichen Litteratur bis Eusebius (Leipz.: 1897) are authoritative for the same period. For studies covering later centuries as well as the first three the student must turn to the monumental works of Ebert, Gröber, and Manitius. Adolf Ebert's Allgemeine Geschichte der Literatur des Mittelalters im Abendlande (3 vols. Leipz.: 1874–1887; vol. I, 2d ed. 1889) traces Latin Christian literature to the beginning of the eleventh century, but there are omissions that must be supplied from later works. G. Gröber's Grundriss der romanischen Philologie (II, 97–432) is very helpful. M. Manitius' first work, Geschichte der christlich-lateinischen Poesie bis zur Mitte des 8. Jahrh. (Stuttgart: 1891), is now supplemented by his larger Geschichte der lateinischen Literatur des Mittelalters (Th. I, von Justinian bis zur Mitte des zehnten Jahrh. München: 1911; being a part of Iwan von Müller's Handbuch der klassischen Altertums-Wissenschaft). These books are authoritative. They may be supplemented by the proper sections in the following histories of Roman literature: J. C. F. Bähr, Gesch. der römischen Litt., vol. IV Die christlich-römische Litt. (2d ed. Karlsruhe: 1873); Teuffel-Kroll *et al.*, Gesch. der römischen Litt. (6th ed., vol. III, 1913); M. Schanz, Gesch. der römischen Litt. bis zum Gesetzgebungswerk des Kaisers Justinian (Part IV, 3d ed., 1914). C. T. Cruttwell's Literary History of Early Christianity (2 vols. Lond.: 1893), A. Harnack's celebrated History of Dogma (trans. from 3d German ed. of author's Lehrbuch der Dogmengeschichte, 7 vols. Lond.: 1897–99), J. Donaldson's A Critical History of Christian Literature and Doctrine from the Death of the Apostles to the Nicene Council (3 vols. Lond.: 1864–1866. 1 vol. in 2d ed., 1874; continued only as far as the apologists), O. Zöckler's Gesch. der theologischen Litteratur (Gotha: 1890. Handb. der theolog. Wissenschaften, I Suppl em.), and G. Boissier's La fin du paganisme, étude sur les dernières luttes religieuses en occident au 4^e siècle (2d ed. Paris: 1894) will afford general orientation in the field of Christian apology and dogma. W. P. Ker's The Dark Ages (Lond.: 1904) contains a valuable chapter on Latin authors from the sixth to the eleventh century. In H. O. Taylor's Classical Heritage of the Middle Ages (N.Y.: 1901) see Chap. IX (beginnings of Christian poetry and accentual verse, Oracula Sibyllina, early Latin Christian poets): the bibliographical notes on this chapter, contained in the appendix of the work, will be especially valuable to the student who wishes to gain a general knowledge of the poetry of the epoch. For saints' legends see Caxton's Golden Legend of the Lives of the Saints (1483), a translation of Jacopus de Voragine's Legenda Aurea (*c.* 1275). On saints' legends see G. H. Gerould, Saints' Legends (noted above, § 11); H. Delehaye, Les légendes hagiographiques (2d ed. 1906; English trans. by Mrs. N. M. Crawford, The Legends of the Saints, 1907); and other works noted by Gerould, p. 351 ff. For further bibliography see the works of Krüger, Ebert, Manitius, Gröber, and Bähr, as just mentioned.

The *texts* will be found in the vast collection of the Fathers edited by J. P. Migne, Cursus Patrologiae Completus. I, Patrologia Latina (221 vols. Paris: 1844–1864; continued for writers later than 1216 by Horoy). See also the Monumenta Germaniae Historica (Hannover: 1826 +). Further references in Krüger, pp. 8–10; particular references for individual authors may be found in Krüger, Ebert, and Manitius, as indicated below.

For English *translations* see A. Roberts and J. Donaldson, Ante-Nicene Fathers, Translations of the Writings of the Fathers down to A.D. 325 (24 vols. Edinb.: 1864–1872; American ed., by H. C. Cox, with additions, 10 vols. N.Y.: 1896); E. B. Pusey, J. Keble, and J. H. Newman, A Library of the Fathers of the Holy Catholic Church, anterior to the Division of the East and West (Oxford: 1838–1885); P. Schaff and H. Wace, A Select Library of the Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church (N.Y.: 1890 +).

Of the heroic poem proper there is scarcely an example (see the Waltharius) in the Christian Latin poetry of this epoch. But the student of later Christian epics (such as Vida's Christiad, Du Bartas' Création, Tasso's Il mondo creato, Milton's Paradise Lost, and Klopstock's Messias) will discern tendencies toward Christian epos in the hexameter biblical paraphrases of the first five or six hundred years. For the investigation of origins and of development of types, the student of romances, of the long didactic poem, or of the allegorical narrative will find in Prudentius, the most decisive poetic force before Dante, much of value.

The influence of both Greek and Latin epic upon early narrative and allegorical Christian poems offers another interesting field for research. The study of the kind and extent of this influence, of the characteristic changes in narrative style, conception, and point of view, together with the causes of such changes, will lead to inductions significant not only for the laws of literary variation, but also for the essential traits of the early Christian character and world-view. Is it true that when Prudentius and Juvencus, for instance, imitated Virgil they produced works "in which the convictions, the arguments, the moralizings might be sincere enough, but in which the real poetry of Christianity could have but little part" (Comparetti-Benecke, Virgil in the Middle Ages, N.Y.: 1895, p. 160)?

In the following pages certain general trends of narrative development are noted. (1) The metrical paraphrase of passages from the Old and New Testaments is one of the earliest narrative forms to be developed. Beginning with slavish fidelity to the sources, it advances to considerable freedom and originality (Juvencus, Victorinus (?), Hilarius of Arles, C. Marius Victor, Sedulius, Avitus, Arator, *et al.*). (2) The allegorical poem is a popular form that shows comparatively little development (Prudentius, Fulgentius (prose), *et al.*). (3) The Christian hero is the Saint, and lives of the saints, in both verse and prose, afford the staple narrative interest of the entire epoch (Prudentius, Paulinus of Nola; Paulinus of Périgueux, Venantius Fortunatus, Alcuin, Walafrid Strabo, Milo, Heiric, Flodoard, and anonymous poems). (4) Secular epical literature develops coincidently with the secularization of the power of the Church and the rise of the Carolingian dynasties (Hibernicus Exul, anon. poems of the age of Charlemagne, Walafrid Strabo, Ermoldus Nigellus, Ekkehard, Hrosvitha). (5) Narratives of visions of the other world, of hell, purgatory, and paradise, supplement the saints' legends and give rise to a distinct species of composition (Gregory the Great, Walafrid Strabo, and Ansellus; cf. Dante). (6) Lyrical-epic forms arise, largely as a result of the panegyrical purpose of the secular epics. (7) Toward the close of the epoch epical narrative degenerates to versified annals, with no proper unity of plot (Poeta Saxo and Abbo). (8) Also toward the close of the epoch dialogue is used as a method of narration, thus giving rise to a dramatic-epical variety (Purchard von Reichenau, *et al.*).

The development of each of these narrative tendencies or subspecies, their interrelation, their derivation from older sources (especially Virgil), and their influence upon contemporary and later vernacular narratives, are the general topics for investigation afforded by the Latin narrative literature of this period. The determination of the relation of Dante to these tendencies or species gives an object and a singular significance to such investigation. Finally, the uncertainty of the technique of plot, character, and action, displayed throughout the period, and the confusion of annals, history, didacticism, and poetry, which is the immediate cause of this uncertain technique, suggest a study of form, which as yet has attracted but little attention.

A. *From the Second Century to the Time of Constantine (323).* During this period the new religion was contending for the right to exist. Literature, mostly prose, is polemical and apologetic.

One poem, however, the De Ave Phoenice, shows aim and construction, and is something more than mere versifying. Though the author makes such free use of pagan myth as would scarcely have been tolerated by the myth-hating Christian leaders of the day, Tertullian, Cyprian, and Arnobius, it is generally supposed that he wrote in this period. The poem has been attributed to Lactantius (*c.* 300); and it may be compared with the later and longer Anglo-Saxon Phoenix, which is based upon it and is perhaps the work of Cynewulf.

Texts and Monographs. For bibliography see Krüger, 317; Ebert 1: 97; Manitius, G. c.-l. P., 44. On the Phoenix: R. Loebe, In Scriptorem Carminis de Phoenice . . . Observationes (in *Jhb. für protestantische Theologie*, 18: 34–65. 1892); A. S. Cook, The Christ of Cynewulf, p. lxiii ff. For a critical edition of the Old English Phoenix see O. Schlotterose (in *Bonner Beiträge z. Anglistik*, No. 25, 1908).

The concluding part of the Carmen Apologeticum of Commodianus (*fl. c.* 250), who has been called the first Christian Latin poet, contains a description of last things and is important as a forerunner of much other descriptive narration of the same theme. It is noteworthy that the hexameters disregard quantity for accent, — an early sign of the change to romance prosody. Commodianus is familiar with both Virgil and Lucretius. His work is didactic, but it is maintained that some of his forms are original, — "acrostics, strophes, rimes, and line-formations" in hexameters (Krüger, 318).

Texts and Monographs. See Krüger, 217, 320; Ebert 1: 89; Manitius, G. c.-l. P., 28. For the period as a whole see O. Bardenhewer, Gesch. der altkirch. lit. (2 vols. Freiburg i. B.: 1902–03).

B. *From the Time of Constantine to the Death of St. Augustine* (*430*). During this period the new religion wins not only recognition but supremacy. The Church gradually becomes a strongly centralized institution. It is the age of the ardent theology of St. Augustine; the polemical fierceness of Tertullian is no longer necessary. The early anathema of pagan culture is modified, and the Christian genius is enriched and broadened by an assimilation of Roman and other ancient laws, customs, and artistic ideals. Attending this assimilation is a growth of Christian poetry, characterized in part by an imitation of classic types and in part by the virtual creation of new types.

About 330 Juvencus completed what is the first definitely dated hexameter Latin paraphrase of biblical narratives. His work, the Evangeliorum Libri IV, is thus the forerunner not only of Caedmon and Cynewulf but also of Paradise Lost and the Messias. In the exordium Juvencus speaks of the fame of Homer and Virgil, but claims for his own subject a greater 'diuturnity' because he substitutes Christian verity for pagan myths. Thus it is clear that Juvencus feels that he has taken a step — according to him, a long step — toward perfecting the epic type. But he is at pains also to belittle the significance of mortal life in comparison with the life everlasting, thus setting up a *Weltanschauung* almost the opposite of that of Homer and Virgil. In a word, Christian spiritualism has taken the place of Homeric naturalism as the motivation of the epic world. For the rest, his style is simple, a relief from the sophisticated rhetoric that from the beginning had invaded Christian prose and verse style alike; but his hexameters are often wooden and uninspired. With this work may be mentioned two contemporary paraphrases — the De Sodoma, the Carmen de Fratribus Septem Macchabeis attributed to Victorinus — and the Cento Vergilianus of Proba, all of which cultivate with more or less freedom the epic handling of biblical subjects.

The most significant poet of the age was Prudentius (*c.* 348–*c.* 410). His Psychomachia points the contrast between Christianity and Paganism under an allegory of the virtues and vices, and is, says Ebert, "the first example of a purely allegorical poem in the literature of the occident." Its relation to succeeding allegorical poems is an interesting subject of study. The poem, in spite of its aesthetic inferiority, was very popular in the Middle Ages. In his lyrical epic, the Peristephanon, Prudentius illustrates the possibilities of a new, romantic type. Here the legends of the martyrs are treated with such combination of lyric and narrative art that the poem seems not far removed from the popular metrical narratives of the Middle Ages, or even some of the art poetry of more modern times. With it should be contrasted the Greek romances and their Renaissance revivals; and several of the descriptive-narrative poems (Carmina Natalitia de S. Felice) of Paulinus of Nola (Ebert 1: 302 ff.) should be studied as similar expressions from the same general period. In his didactic Hamartigenia, Prudentius follows the moralizing tone of Horace and Lucretius as well as the 'eloquence' of Virgil.

Texts and Monographs. For Juvencus see Ebert 1: 114; Manitius, G. c.-l. P., 55. On other paraphrases and the Virgilian cento: Ebert 1: 122–127; Manitius, G. c.-l. P., 51, 112, 123. On Prudentius: Encyc. Brit., 11th ed., under Prudentius; Ebert 1: 251 ff.; Manitius, G. c.-l. P., 61 ff. For the influence of Prudentius on later writers, Manitius, G. l. L. M., Alphabetisches Register, under Prudentius.

C. *From the Death of St. Augustine (430) to the Time of Charlemagne (780).*

To the transitional period of Latin poetry from A. D. 350 to the time of Charlemagne, E. Norden, Die lateinische Literatur im Uebergang vom Altertum zum Mittelalter is a compendious guide (Hinneberg's Kultur der Gegenwart, Tl. I, Abt. VIII, Die gr. u. lat. Lit. u. Sprache, Berlin u. Leipz.: 1905, pp. 375–411; 3d ed. 1912, p. 483 ff.). See also A. Ozanam, La civilisation au cinquième siècle (Paris: 1862), — beautifully written, but to be used with care.

The writers of the earlier part of the period, to about the middle of the sixth century, continue without significant modification the traditions of Christian poetry established in the age of St. Augustine and Prudentius. Metrical paraphrases of biblical materials are well to the fore, — witness the Metrum in Genesin of Hilarius of Arles, the Alethia seu Commentationum in Genesim Libri III of C. Marius Victor, the Carmen Paschale of Sedulius, and the didactic narrative poems of Dracontius and Avitus. All these are in line of descent from Juvencus, though Avitus shows a degree of independence of his sources that might easily have marked a new step in development had not the barbarian invasions arrested all growth. During the same years the romantic saints' legends were multiplied and, in the hexameters of Paulinus of Périgueux's Vita Martini, they developed a wider scope. The Eucharisticos Deo sub Ephemeridis Meae Textu of Paulinus of Pella appears to be a verse variety of the prose autobiography.

For further notices and for bibliography see Ebert 1: 357–409; Manitius, G. c.-l. P., 157–348.

During the second part of the period, from about 550 to the age of Charlemagne, ancient society finally disappeared in the welter of the Byzantine wars and the Lombard invasion, and Christian society took its place. The power of the papacy increased rapidly, and the energies of the Church were bent not upon apology and polemic, but upon spreading its authority among the barbaric peoples of England, Germany, and France. The disappearance of ancient culture, on the one hand, and the temporal aggrandizement of the papacy, on the other, were unfavorable to the development of Christian-Latin literature. As a result this division of our period, though it was longer by almost a century and a half than the earlier portion, produced fewer authors and fewer works. The De Actibus Apostolorum of Arator is a paraphrase in hexameters, with mystical and allegorical digressions and interpretations. Arator may be said to have been the last Roman poet of Italy. Flavius Cresconius Corippus, who resided in some small town of north Africa, celebrated the Moorish wars and the deeds of a certain Johannes in an epic of eight books. Venantius Fortunatus, the last Roman poet among the Franks, composed another Vita Martini, and he makes it evident in the beginning of his poem that he regards his production as in the line of epic descent from Juvencus, Sedulius, Prudentius, and others.

For bibliography see Ebert 1: 514–542; Manitius, G. c.-l. P., 366–376, 438–470; by the same, G. l. L. M., 162–181.

D. *The Carolingian Renaissance* (*780–814*). The revival of literature that took place in the Frankish dominion of Charlemagne was the outcome of altered conditions, ecclesiastical, academic, political. The new literature arose not from the Church, as hitherto, but from the palace schools of Charlemagne, which owed their character to Anglo-Saxon learning and Alcuin, the prelate and scholar, on the one hand, and to Italian-Longobardic erudition and Paulus Diaconus, the historian, on the other. The new poetry was of the court, and was inspired by the revival of the *imperium* in the person of the king. These circumstances favored a decided secularity of literary tone, — a change in Christian Latin literature, little hindered by a church that was itself busily engaged in strengthening and extending the arm of secular power.

In studying this secular tendency in the narrative poetry of the age it is proper to consider whether the secular epic of Rome exerted a greater influence than the Christian poems of Juvencus and his followers. The chief pagan sources were, perhaps, Virgil and Ovid; the Christian, Fortunatus, and also Fulgentius — whose allegorizing way is especially discernible in the poetry of Theodulf. The extent of the knowledge of Greek and Latin authors in this age demands further study. Alcuin, for instance, in one of his poems, gives us a list of the manuscripts over which he presided at the library of the York monastery, and Theodulf includes in a poem a list of his favorite authors.

In content and manner the narrative poems frequently seem to anticipate subsequent developments within the type. Though Alcuin's hexameter Vita S. Willibrordi is perhaps negligible, yet his De Sanctis Eboracensis Ecclesiae is a forerunner of the versified chronicle. Compare Aedilvulf's poem on the history of his monastery (see Manitius, G. l. L. M., 552). In their epical celebration of contemporary wars, the Versus ad Karolum Imperatorem of a certain Hibernicus Exul (Dungal?) and the anonymous Carmen de Carolo Magno faintly adumbrate a national epic poetry. In the first the legend of Troy is mentioned. The second clearly shows the influence of Fortunatus and of Virgil, and is characterized by a picturesque style and love of color: it displays a strong interest in the marvellous, and in the persons of the pope and the emperor brings into connection the secular and religious interests of the age. A still more popular note, and therein suggestive of the popular epic lay, is found in the mourning songs (epical-lyric) in rhythmic — not quantitative — iambic trimeters that bewail the death of one of Charlemagne's generals and the fall of the city of Aquileja (see Ebert 2: 86–91). And Angilbert's triumphal song in celebration of Pepin's victory over the Avars is said to suggest the movement and spirit of the later romances. It is written in rhythmic trochaic tetrameter. The student should also note the popularity of the eclogue at the court of Charlemagne (Ebert 2: 64 ff.).

Texts and Monographs. See the bibliographical notes in Ebert 2: 12–35, 56–69, 85–91; Manitius, G. l. L. M., 278–280, 370–374, 543–547. On Alcuin see C. J. B. Gaskoin, Alcuin: His Life and his Work (Lond.: 1903); Monnier, Alcuin et Charlemagne (Paris: 1863); J. B. Mullinger, The Schools of Charles the Great and the Restoration of Education in the 9th Century (Lond.: 1877); K. Werner, Alkuin und sein Jahrhundert (Paderborn: 1876). Special mention may be made here of two important collections of texts: Die handschriftliche Ueberlieferung der lateinischen Dichtungen aus der Zeit der Karolinger (in *Neues Archiv der Gesellschaft für ältere deutsche Gesch.*, 1879); Poetae Latini Aevi Carolini (in Monum. Germ. Hist.).

E. *Decline and Fall of the Carolingian Renaissance*, from the death of Charlemagne to the accession of Otto the Great (814–936). The confused and uncertain political conditions of this period (division of the Frankish Kingdom, attacks of the Danes, Normans, Magyars, and Saracens, and the rise of feudalism) were attended by a gradual decline in literary endeavor. The most productive branch of literature was theological. But the main streams of Christian epical expression may still be traced. *The versified lives of saints*, usually from a prose original, are exemplified in the anonymous St. Gall, in the St. Othmar (both in rhymes), in short lives (in hexameter) by Walafrid Strabo, the most gifted poet of the age, in the Vita St. Amandi of Milo, the Vita St. Germani of Heiric, and lives by Hucbald of St. Amand. These should be compared with the prose lives of the period, which may be traced through Ebert (vols. 2, 3) and Manitius. The influence of the plot technique of both prose and verse lives upon the vernacular Christian epic, especially of the Anglo-Saxons, is of considerable importance (see Smithson as cited above, § 11). *The secular epical story*, the rise of which under Charlemagne has just been noted above, is represented in this age by the De Imagine Tetrici of Walafrid Strabo and the De Gestis Caesaris (or In Honorem Hludovici Imperatoris) of Ermoldus Nigellus, both somewhat insincere in their celebration of the not resplendent glories of Louis the Pious. Ermoldus' production is noteworthy on two accounts: it is one of the earliest Latin epical poems to refer to the Saracens; and by its representation of William, Count of Toulouse, as an heroic leader it is related to the Carolingian romance cycle of Guillaume d'Orange, called by the trouvères the *geste* of Garin de Monglane.

Texts and Monographs. Walafrid Strabo's lives of the saints have been edited by Dümmler (Mon. Germ. Hist. Poet. Lat. II, 1884, p. 259 ff.). Bibliography for these and other lives: Ebert 2: 277–292, 3: 188 ff.; Manitius, G. l. L. M., 302–315, 577–580, 588–592. For the secular epic of Walafrid Strabo and Ermoldus Nigellus see Ebert 2: 145–146, 154–155, 170–176; Manitius, G. l. L. M., 302–314, 522–557; for a more complete bibliography of Walafrid see Potthast, Bibliotheca Hist. Med. Aevi, Berlin: 1894, 1102 ff.; Walafrid's works may be found in Migne's Patrologia Latina, 113, 114. Ermoldus' poem is in the 2d vol. of the Monum. Germ. Hist. Scriptores, p. 464 ff.; and has been edited by Dümmler, Poetae Latini Aevi Carolini, vol. II (Berlin: 1881–1884). On the cycle of Guillaume d'Orange see Gautier, Épopées franç., vol. IV (2d ed., 1882); P. Becker, Die altfranz. Wilhelmsage, etc. (Halle: 1896), and Der südfranz. Sagenkreis, etc. (Halle: 1898); J. Bédier, Légendes épiques, vol. I (1908); also articles by Jeanroy in *Romania*, vols. 25, 26, and by Suchier in vol. 32.

The secular narratives of the later part of this period are, with one exception, but little more than versified annals. Poeta Saxo's Annales de Gestis Caroli Magni, written between 888 and 891, follows earlier annals, especially the famous prose chronicle of Einhard (Vita Karoli Magni), to which it adds some poetic coloring. But in place of plot and motive it is content to arrange its materials in mere annalistic fashion, with a decade to each book. The De Bellis Parisiacae Urbis of the Frankish writer Abbo, composed at about the same time, is vivid and full of information, but also annalistic in construction. The exception referred to above is the anonymous Gesta Berengarii Imperatoris, written in Italy between 912 and 924: the author somewhat artistically selects for his panegyric appropriate *gesta*, and so attains a certain unity of effect.

For bibliography of these three poems see Ebert 3: 125–144; Manitius, G. l. L. M., 583–588, 632–635. For other minor epical poems of this period see Manitius, G. l. L. M., 598–609.

One other of Walafrid's narrative works, the Liber de Visionibus Wettini, deserves special attention as a pioneer in the field of medieval metrical stories of visions of the other world. See, however, the fourth book of Gregory the Great's prose Dialogi (Ebert 1: 547–548) and the rhymed Vision composed by Ansellus (Ebert 3: 175). The history of such *Visions*, culminating in Dante's Commedia, affords a fascinating study, which may be extended backward through the underworld adventures of the old epic heroes.

See C. Fritzsche, Die lateinischen Visionen des Mittelalters bis zur Mitte des 12. Jahrh., in *Roman. Forsch.*, vols. 2, 3; E. Becker, Medieval Visions of Heaven and Hell (Baltimore: 1899); W. H. Schofield, Eng. Lit. from the Norman Conquest (1906), pp. 397–403, and the bibliography p. 484; A. F. Ozanam, Dante et la philosophie catholique au 3e siècle, 5th ed.; K. Borinski, Ueber poetische Vision und Imagination, ein historisch-psychologischer Versuch anlässlich Dantes (1897). For some of Dante's apocalyptic predecessors see Grandgent, Dante (1916), pp. 199–223; and for biblical and early post-biblical visions, Gayley, Plays of our Forefathers (1907), pp. 228–278. Other works noted below, VI, A, References.

For *rhythmical epical songs* of contemporary and biblical subjects, see Ebert 2: 311 ff. The relation of these Latin rhythmical (accentual) songs to vernacular epical poetry is an important topic. See Du Méril, Poésies populaires latines antérieures au XIIe siècle (Paris: 1843); Ker, Dark Ages; *et al.* — The student of the *eclogue* will find material in this period, as in the previous (see Manitius, G. l. L. M., pp. 279, 550, 572, 590, etc.).

F. *The Age of Otto the Great and his Immediate Successors (936–1000).* Although the disintegration of empires and the rise of feudalism during the ninth century resulted in a political and linguistic confusion that at first was unfavorable to literary production, yet by the end of the century this very confusion was already the source of new inventions and endeavors. Professor Ker speaks of "the polyglot experimental character of literature, the great variety of tastes, the immense possibilities of new discovery, the intercourse of different languages at the end of the ninth century" (Dark Ages, p. 221, Note). The rise of German power, also, under Henry the Fowler and Otto the Great, and the birth under German auspices of the Holy Roman Empire, were the occasion of a renewed interest in literature, inasmuch as the new court emulated the court of Charlemagne in all its former glory, — literature and the arts included. Among the great schools of the time, the most famous were those of St. Gall, Fulda, Tours, and Corvey. The new imperial interests and the variety of the educational influences of the tenth century (Roman, Romance, and Greek) are well typified in the character and schooling of Otto III, whose learning was such that he was called "the wonder of the world" the while he dreamed of uniting all peoples under his rule (see Encyc. Brit., 11th ed., article Germany, vol. XI, p. 837).

Under the influence of these German imperialisms we note some access of vigor in the Latin epical literature of the north. The Waltharius of Ekkehard of St. Gall is "the most important poem of the tenth century" and one of Germany's chief epics. In it may be studied side by side pagan subject, Christian ideals, and Virgilian influence upon descriptions of battle. The poem may well be called an art epic; both its subject and its manner are nobly conceived. The study of it calls, of course, for that of other forms in which the Walter saga has appeared: Thidreks

Saga, chaps. 241–244, and Skaldskaparmál; the Anglo-Saxon Waldere fragment; the Scottish ballads of Earl Brand and Erlinton (cf. F. J. Child, Eng. and Scott. Pop. Ballads, 1: 88 ff.). — An admirable example of the new experiments of the age is found in the beast epic Ecbasis Captivi, the oldest medieval poem of its kind, with which should be compared the Aesopic and other animal fables of antiquity, the Physiologus, or Bestiary, of the Christian Fathers, and the great epic of Reynard the Fox. — To these examples of Latin narrative originating in Germany may be added the eight religious narratives, in leonine hexametrical distichs, of the nun Hrosvitha of Gandersheim; the same author's verse chronicle, Carmen de Gestis Oddonis, in which the Roman epic is taken as a model, and her poem on the history of her convent; also the poems of Walther von Speier and Purchard von Reichenau (note the dialogue used as a narrative method, and compare the Gesta Apollonii mentioned by Ebert 3: 330; see Ebert 3: 333–342). For the tenth-century Latin version of the Gesta Apollonii, see Manitius, G. l. L. M., 614–616. — In France, the Latin poetry of the tenth century is less important than the vernacular. Ebert refers to the Haager fragment, a Charlemagne story which Gaston Paris believed to be a translation from a *chanson*, and to the epical saints-legend of Flodoard, De Triumphis Christi (Ebert 3: 349–351, 354–357). — For prose lives of the saints, see Ebert 3: 394 ff., 446 ff.; G. H. Gerould, Saints' Legends (Boston: 1916).

Texts and Monographs. The Waltharius has been edited, with a translation into German, by J. V. Scheffel and A. Holder (Stuttgart: 1874); for bibliography see Ebert 3: 265–276; Manitius, G. l. L. M., 609–614; Encyc. Brit., under Waltharius. On the beast epic see Foulet, as noted above, § 11; J. Jacobs, The Fables of Aesop (1889); F. Storr's article, Fable, in Encyc. Brit.; Laucherts, Gesch. des Physiologus (Strassburg: 1889); E. Peters, Der griechische Physiologus und seine orientalischen Uebersetzungen (Berlin: 1898); Ebert 3: 276–285; Manitius, G. l. L. M., 616–619; further under Foulet. On Hrosvitha: Ebert 3: 285–314; Manitius, G. l. L. M., 619–632; article Hrosvitha in Encyc. Brit.

G. *Eleventh to the Fourteenth Century.*

Particularly helpful is Gröber's Übersicht über die lateinische Lit. von der Mitte des 6. Jahrh. bis 1350 (in his Grundriss der roman. Philol., II, 1 (Strassburg: 1902). An attempt toward a general view of the period is contained in the history of Christian Greek and Latin literature by the Jesuit savant Alexander Baumgartner (Die lateinische und griechische Lit. der christlichen Völker, Freiburg: 1900, being vol. IV of the author's Gesch. der Weltliteratur), which extends from the beginnings of Christian literature up to the Latin poems of Pope Leo XIII (*ob.* 1903). Among older works see Polycarp Leyser's Historia Poetarum et Poematum Medii Aevi (1721). Quadrio and Blankenburg-Sulzer supply lists of Latin writers under heads pertaining to the literary types. For a brief first view of the field see the first chapter of Saintsbury's Flourishing of Romance (Lond.: 1897), or pp. 517–520 of E. Norden's Die lateinische Lit. im Übergang vom Altertum zum Mittelalter (in Hinneberg's Kultur d. Gegenwart, Tl. I, Abt. VIII. 3d ed. 1912). Among works dealing with special portions of the field, vols. III–VI of Tiraboschi's Storia della lett. ital. (Milano: 1823), and the second and third vols. (F. Novati, Origini della lingua; N. Zingarelli, Dante) of the Storia lett. d' Italia scritta da una società di professori, may be consulted for the Italian division; for the German portion, R. Koegel, Gesch. der deutschen Lit. bis zum Ausgange des Mittelalters (Strassburg: 1897); also Koberstein, Geiger, and Voigt (as below). For the French portion, see the vols. of the Hist. litt. de la France of the Congregation of St. Maur (Ed., P. Paris); for the Spanish, Amador de los Rios, Historia crítica de la lit. española (1861 +); for the English, vol. III of Henry Morley's English Writers (3d ed. Lond.: 1893), Chap. II of W. H. Schofield's Eng. Lit. from the Norman Conquest to Chaucer (N.Y.: 1906), and T. Wright, Biographia Britannica Literaria, Anglo-Norman Period (Lond.: 1846). Among works on the general history of the civilization and culture of the period, see A. Bartoli, I precursori del Rinascimento (Firenze: 1876); L. Geiger, Renaissance und Humanismus in Italien und Deutschland (1882); G. Giesebrecht, De Litterarum Studiis apud Italos Primis Medii Aevi Saeculis (Berlin: 1845); H. H. Milman, Hist. of Latin Christianity (8 vols. N.Y.: 1860); J. E. Sandys, A Hist. of Classical Scholarship from the 6th Cent. B.C. to the End of the Middle Ages (Cambridge: 1903); H. O. Taylor, The Mediaeval Mind (2 vols. Lond.: 1911); G. Voigt, Die Wiederbelebung des classischen Alterthums (2 vols. 3d ed. Berlin: 1893). A concise list of historical works is appended to H. W. C. Davis' Medieval Europe (Home Univ. Library).

V. French Epics.

A. *Chanson de Roland.*

There are several bibliographical guides to material on the Chanson de Roland. See J. Bauquier, Bibliographie de la Chanson de Roland (Heilbronn: 1877); Petit de Julleville, La Chanson de Roland, traduction nouvelle, etc. (Paris: 1878; pp. 30–45); L. Gautier, Les épopées françaises (2d ed. 4 vols. Paris: 1878–94; see vol. III, pp. 494–591, —vol. III is dated 1880); K. Nyrop, Den oldfranske Heltedigtning (Copenh.: 1883; see pp. 464–469. This work has been translated into Italian by E. Gorra, Storia dell' epopea francese, 1888); Körting, Encykl., etc. (1886; 3: 329–331); E. Seelmann, Bibliographie des altfranzösischen Rolandsliedes (Heilbronn: 1888); L. Gautier, Bibliographie des Chansons de Geste (Paris: 1897). This last has been reprinted, with additions that bring it down to 1906, by J. Geddes, Jr. (La Chanson de Roland. N.Y.: 1906; pp. lxxxix–clvi). The student will find the most important part of the critical paraphernalia for the Roland in this reprint, and its repetition here would be an uncalled-for labor. For a complete bibliography of works up to 1888, consult Seelmann as noted. See further the bibliography at the head of B, below.

The two most interesting and important questions concerning the Roland are (*a*) how did the poem arrive at its present form? and (*b*) why did its growth stop when it reached its present form? The development of the poem from popular beginnings, the changes of culture through which it passed, the retelling by later ages on a broader historical scale and with greater artistic skill, are facts that find their parallel in other epic literatures; and they are of very great value because of the parallelism, for they provide material for establishing the principles of the earlier stages of epic development. But to just what stage of Greek epic development the Roland in its present form is analogous is a question that has not been finally answered. Does it correspond to the courtly minstrel lay that perhaps developed just before 'Homer' put his hand to the final telling of the stories of the remote past? Or is it the analogue of the Iliad in its present form, the differences of conception and treatment as between the two epics being due merely to the accident of greater or less poetic genius in the respective 'shapers'? The student need not despair of gaining further insight into this question; for though there has been much investigation of the Roland, and some of that of a comparative nature, systematic comparison may yet be pushed to more definite results. — The comparison of the cultural strata revealed in the archaeology of the Roland and the Iliad should afford material aid toward establishing the relative position of the poems in the history of epic development (compare Chadwick's Heroic Age, cited above, § 11).

Editions of the French text are by Michel (ed. princeps, 1837; also 1869); Génin (1850); Th. Müller (Göttingen: 1851, etc. The 3d ed., 1878, is regarded as standard); Böhmer (Halle: 1872); Gautier (8th ed. Tours: 1881; also standard, — with translation into modern French opposite the ancient text); Clédat (1885); Stengel, standard, and the best for the general student (1900+). Some of the *translations* into modern French are as follows: in prose, by Génin and by Gautier; in verse, by Jônain (1862), Petit de Julleville (1871), A. d'Avril (4th ed., 1880). English translations: by Mrs. Marsh (Lond.: 1853); J. O'Hagan, in verse (Lond.: 1880), with an interesting literary introduction; L. Rabillon, in verse (N.Y.: 1885); Isabel Butler, in prose (Boston: 1904). The most recent translation is by Leonard Bacon (Yale Univ. Press, and Oxford Univ. Press: 1914), in ballad metres of swinging rhythm and vigorous spirit. The introduction treats of the literary characteristics of the poem and the controversy concerning the personality of the author. German translations by Hertz (Stuttgart: 1861), E. Müller (Hamburg: 1891), Schmilinsky (Halle: 1895).

References. The following list indicates some of the more important treatises bearing upon the subject, — see especially those of G. Paris, Rajna, Nyrop, and Gautier: M. Arnold, Essays in Criticism, 2d Series, The Study of Poetry (Lond.: 1888); A. d'Avril, La Chanson de Roland, Introd. (Paris: 1865); R. Bauer, Ueber die subjectiven Wendungen in den altfrz. Karlsepen, etc. (Frankfurt a. M.: 1889); J. Bédier, Les légendes épiques, as noted above, § 11, — very important; I. Bekker, Vergleichung homerischen und altfranzösischen Sitten (in *Monatsberichte der Berliner Akademie*, 1886, pp. 133, 316, 465, 577, 634, 741): cf. articles by the same author (*ibid.*, 1867, pp. 429–444, 681–689, 730–740); G. Brueckner, Das Verhältnis des französischen Rolandsliedes zur Turpinischen Chronik, etc. (Rostock: 1905); V. Crescini, Orlando nella Chanson de Roland, etc. (Bologna: 1880); Diehl, Die Rolandssage in der altfrz. Poesie (Marienwerder: 1867); H. Drees, Der Gebrauch der Epitheta ornantia im altfrz. Rolandsliede (Münster: 1883); T. Eicke, Zur neueren Literaturgeschichte der Rolandsage in Deutschland und Frankreich (Leipz.: 1891); L. Gautier, as above; by the same, L'idée religieuse dans la poésie épique du moyen âge (Paris: 1868); J. Geddes, Jr., as above; F. Génin, La Chanson de Roland (Paris: 1850; pp. vi–xv); P. Graevell, Die Characteristik der Personen im Rolandslied (Heilbr.: 1880); W. M. Hart, Ballad and Epic (see § 11, above); C. T. Hoeft, Franc, Franceis und Franc im Rol. (Strassburg: 1891); W. P. Ker, Epic and Romance (2d ed. Lond.: 1908; see Chap. V, a valuable chapter, and Index); S. Luce, Le génie français dans la Chanson de Roland (in *Rev. contemp.*, 15: 630–645); F. B. Luquiens, The Reconstruction of the Original Chanson de Roland (reprinted from the *Transactions of the Connecticut Academy of Arts and Sciences*, vol. XV, 111–136, July 1909); A. R. Marsh, an admirable introduction for the English student, cited above, § 11; G. Merlet and E. Lintilhac, Études littéraires sur les classiques français (new ed. 2 vols. Paris: 1899–1900; see vol. II); L. de Monge (see above, § 8); Nyrop's important work, already noted; G. Paris, Hist. poétique de Charlemagne (Paris: 1865; new ed., 1905), — invaluable; by the same, La Chanson de Roland et les Nibelungen (in *Rev. germanique*, 25: 292–302); by the same, La litt. française au moyen âge (3d ed. Paris: 1905; see §§ 33–37, or pp. 55–65, and cf. above, §§ 5, 11), — all works by G. Paris are important; Petit de Julleville, La Chanson de Roland, histoire, analyse, etc. (Paris: 1894); F. Picco, Rolando nella storia e nella poesia (Torino: 1901); P. Rajna, La rotta di Roncisvalle nella letteratura cavalleresca italiana (Bologna: 1871); by the same, Le fonti dell' Orlando Furioso (Firenze: 1876); by the same, Le origini dell' epopea francese (1884), — all of prime importance; F. Scholle, Der Stammbaum der altfrz. und altnord. Überlief. der Rol., etc. (Berlin: 1889); É. Souvestre, Causeries historiques et littéraires, 3^e série (Paris: 1861); F. Settegast, Quellenstudien zur gallo-romanischen Epik (Leipz.: 1904); A. Volta, Storia poetica di Orlando (Bologna: 1894); F. Ziller, Der epische Styl des altfrz. Rolandsliedes (Magdeburg: 1883); N. Zingarelli, L' unità della Chanson de Roland (in *Rivista d'Italia*, Oct. 1907); K. Zutavern, Ueber die altfrz. epische Sprache (Heidelberg: 1885). — For the Roland in Italy, see the Italian works just mentioned. For the German Rolandslied, see Paul's Grundriss (2d ed., 2: 1, 172); Golther (in *Zeitschr. f. deut. Alterthum*, 27: 70 ff.); Gautier, Épopées (III, 546–547, Note); Paris, Hist. poétique, etc., p. 118 ff.; Geddes, as cited above (see pp. lxix, cxl–cxlii); B. Baumgarten, Stilistische Untersuchungen zum deutschen Rolandsliede. The text of the German Roland has been edited by W. Grimm (Ruolandes Liet. Göttingen: 1838), and by Bartsch (Deut. Dicht. des M.A., III. 1874). — For the Roland in the Netherlands, Norway, Sweden, Denmark, England, Spain, and Italy, see Geddes, pp. lxx–lxxx, cxliii–clx.

Much material on the Roland is contained in the periodicals. Only a very few typical references can be mentioned here: *Herrig's Archiv*, 48: 291; *Rev. critique*, 1869, 2: 173; *Revue germanique*, 25: 292; *Romania*, 2: 329, 480; 7: 435; 11: 400, 570; 12: 113; *Roman. Forsch.*, 1: 429, 452; *Zeitschr. f. rom. Phil.*, 4: 371, 583; 9: 204. For further guide to the periodicals, see Petit de Julleville, Paris, Gautier, and the references to bibliographies given at the beginning of this division.

For references on the institution of chivalry, see in this section, below, VI, E, under Tasso.

B. *Other Chansons de Geste.*

For titles, texts, and general bibliography, consult Gautier, Bibliographie and Les épopées, G. Paris, La litt. française (pp. 285–290), Saintsbury, The Flourishing of Romance (pp. 38–43, following Gautier, and giving a partial roster of the Chansons that have been printed), Nyrop, Demogeot, and Constans, — as listed and described in the references below. See also Körting, Encykl., etc., 3: 312–336. Refer, in addition, to the bibliography given above in connection with the Troubadours (see § 6, VII, B), for relations between their lyric and the epical Chansons. In addition to the bibliographical works listed at the head of VII in § 6, consult: U. Chevalier, Répertoire des sources historiques du moyen âge (2d ed., 2 vols. in 4. Paris: 1905–07); A. Molinier, Les sources de l'histoire de France des origines aux guerres d'Italie (5 vols. Paris: 1901–06); E. Langlois, Table des noms propres de toute nature compris dans les Chansons de Geste imprimées (Paris: 1904).

Most of the studies that have concerned themselves with this field have aimed to establish texts, trace sources and borrowings, and show international distribution of themes. The general facts that there was much borrowing and that the distribution of the themes was extensive are of importance because they confirm the supposition that in the evolution of the epic such conditions generally occur and constitute a stage. And the methods of borrowing are important in so far as they show the specific laws of the epic growth at this particular stage. But when the historian contents himself, as too often has been the case, with the mere results of *Fingerfertigkeit*, the upshot is but the gossip of investigation. There is room for significant endeavor in the correlation of the chanson stage with those that precede and succeed in the development of the folk epic. Particular attention should be paid to the union of lyrical and epical qualities in the Chansons. Is this union characteristic of the chanson stage in other literatures? If so, how is it related to the consciousness of the age? And from what change of circumstances does the epical consciousness as such develop?

Editions. See the publications of the Société des anciens textes français and the series called Les anciens poètes de la France. For detailed bibliography of texts see the guides already noted at the head of this division and of § 6, VII, B.

References. The following works are representative of what has been done by way of criticism upon the Chansons: the anthologies of K. Bartsch and others (see above, § 6, VII, B, *general anthologies*); E. Altner, Über die Chastïements in den altfranzösischen Chansons de Geste (Leipz.: 1885); J. Altona, Gebete und Anrufungen in den Ch. de Geste (1883); J. Bédier, Les légendes épiques, as noted above, under Chanson de Roland; I. Bekker, Gegenüberstellung homerischer und altfrz. Sitte und Ausdrucksweise (in *Monatsberichte d. Berl. Akad. d. Wissenschaften*, 1865–66; and a similar article in the vol. for 1867); F. Castets, Recherches sur les rapports des Chansons de Geste et de l'épopée chevaleresque italienne (in *Rev. d. langues romanes*, vols. 27 ff.); L. Constans, Chrestomathie de l'ancien français, IX^e–XV^e siècles (Paris: 1906; see pp. 6–18); W. D. Crabb, Culture History in the Chanson de Geste — Aymeri de Narbonne (Univ. of Chicago Press); E. Crépet, ed., Les poëtes français, etc. (4 vols. Paris: 1861; see vol. I Table des Matières, Préliminaires; Les Chansons de Geste; Les Chansons; etc.); J. Demogeot, Hist. de la litt. française (22d ed. Paris: 1886; see Chaps. VII–X, and the bibliography, pp. 691–692); G. Doutrepont, La litt. fr. à la cour des ducs de Bourgogne (in Bibliothèque du XV^e siècle, vol. VIII. Paris: 1909); E. Faral, Les jongleurs en France au moyen âge (in *Bibliothèque de l'école des hautes études*, Sc. hist. et philol., 187. 1910); Fauriel, De l'origine de l'épopée chevaleresque du moyen âge (Paris: 1832);

E. Freymond, Jongleurs und Menestrels (Halle: 1883); L. Gautier, Bibliographie des Chansons de Geste (see above, under A, and below, under Petit de Julleville); by the same, Les épopées fr. (vol. III, pp. 494–591; see above, § 11); for Gröber, see above, § 11; E. Henninger, Sitten und Gebräuche bei der Taufe und Namengebung in der altfrz. Dichtung (Halle: 1891); C. d'Héricault (see above, § 11); W. P. Ker, Epic and Romance (2d ed. Lond.: 1908); G. Kurth, Hist. poétique des Mérovingiens (Paris, etc.: 1893); Abbé de La Rue, Essais historiques sur les bardes, les jongleurs et les trouvères normands et anglo-normands (3 vols. Caen: 1834); H. Massing, Die Geistlichkeit im altfrz. Volksepos (Darmstadt: 1904. Diss.); C. J. Merk, Anschauungen über die Lehre und das Leben der Kirche im altfrz. Heldenepos (in *Beihefte z. Zeitschr. f. roman. Phil.*, No. 41. 1914); P. Meyer (see above, § 11); L. Moland, Origines littéraires de la France, etc. (Paris: 1862); K. Nyrop, Oldfranske Heltedigtning, a very important and reliable work (1883. For an Italian translation see above, § 11); G. Paris, La poésie du moyen âge (2 vols. Paris: 1903–06); by the same, La litt. fr. au moyen âge (see §§ 18–42, and cf. above, §§ 5, 11); by the same, Poèmes et légendes du moyen âge (4th ed. Paris: 1912), — important and reliable; P. Paris, Hist. litt. de la France (Paris: 1852; vol. XXII, pp. 259–755); a short and convenient list of "livres réellement indispensables," by Gautier, in Petit de Julleville's Hist. de la langue et de la litt. fr. (see vol. I, pp. 168–170. Paris: 1896. See pp. 49–170 of the same vol. for a general account of the Chansons, — one of the best accounts the student can consult); E. Quinet, De l'hist. de la poésie (Œuvres complètes, vol. IX. Paris: n. d.); by the same, Rapport sur les épopées françaises du XII^e siècle (Paris: 1831); P. Rajna, I reali di Francia, a valuable work (Bologna: 1872); by the same, and a still more important work, Le origini dell' epopea francese (Firenze: 1884; see above, § 11); G. Saintsbury, The Flourishing of Romance (N. Y.: 1897; see pp. 22–85); W. Scheffler, Geschichte der frz. Volksdichtung und Sage (Leipz.: 1883–85); R. Schröder, Glaube und Aberglaube in der altfrz. Dichtung (Erlangen: 1886); H. Theodor, Die komischen Elemente in den altfrz. Chansons de Geste (in *Beihefte z. Zeitschr. f. roman. Phil.*, No. 48. 1913); J. L. Uhland, Über das altfrz. Epos (in Gesammelte Schriften zur Geschichte der Dichtung und Sage. Herausg. von Holland. 8 vols. Stuttgart: 1865–73; see vol. IV, p. 327 ff.); C. Voretzsch, Die französische Heldensage (Heidelberg: 1894); an article by the same author in Philolog. Studien., Festgabe für E. Sievers (1896). Much material will be found in the periodicals.

C. *Epical Romances: l'Épopée Antique.* Interesting examples of the assimilation of foreign stories into the literature of a nation are furnished by certain epical romances of portentous length dealing with subjects of antiquity. To the fact that in France this assimilation took place when the national *épopée* had already achieved its ripest utterance is due in part, at least, the absence of epic vigor in these later romances. The relations of the *Épopée Antique*, and the *Épopée Courtoise* (see below), to the Chansons de Geste, and the accounting for those relations in terms of development and epical variation, are difficult subjects.

References. For detailed bibliography of the various cycles of the *Épopée Antique* (cycles of Thebes, Troy, Alexander, etc.), and of the individual poems as well, consult in the following list the works by G. Paris (Litt. fr., pp. 290–292) and Petit de Julleville. Representative studies are: D. Comparetti, Virgilio nel medio evo (Livorno: 1870. English trans. by E. F. M. Benecke. Lond.: 1908. See above, § 11); L. Constans, La légende d'Œdipe, etc. (Paris: 1881); R. de Derned, Ueber die den altfrz. Dichtern bekannten epischen Stoffe, etc. (Erlangen: 1887), with which should be used the work of similar title by Birch-Hirschfeld (see above, § 6, VII, B); H. Dunger, Die Sage vom trojanischen Kriege, etc. (Dresden: 1869); E. Faral, Recher. sur les sources lat. des contes et romans court. (Paris: 1913), — influence of Ovid, priority of 'antique' romances; M. Gaster, Ilchester Lectures on Greeko-Slavonic Literature and its Relation to the Folk-Lore of Europe (Lond.: 1887); E. Gorra, Testi inediti di storia trojana (Torino: 1887; see the introduction); A. Graf, Roma nella memoria e nelle immaginazioni del medio evo (Torino: 1882); W. Greif, Die mittelalterlichen Bearbeitungen der Trojanersage (Marburg: 1886); F. H. von der Hagen, Der Roman von König Apollonius in seinen verschiedenen Bearbeitungen (Berlin: 1878); A. Joly, Benoît de Sainte-More et le Roman de Troie, etc. (2 vols. Paris: 1870–71); G. Körting, Dictys und Dares, etc. (Halle: 1874); P. Meyer, Alexandre le Grand dans la littérature française du moyen âge (2 vols. Paris: 1886); G. Paris, La litt. fr. au moyen âge, §§ 43–52, — this and the following work present excellent *résumés* of the subject; Petit de Julleville, vol. I, pp. 171–253, with bibliography of the most important works on pp. 252–253; E. Rohde, Der griechische Roman (Leipz.: 1876), an admirable work, suggestive of questions as to the relation of the Greek romance development and the French romance poems to the epic literatures of the two nations; G. Saintsbury, The Flourishing of Romance (N. Y.: 1897; see Chap. IV, pp. 148–186). Further references in Betz-Baldensperger, La litt. comparée, essai bibliographique, p. 282 ff. (2d ed. Strasbourg: 1904).

For the *romances of adventure*, the first of which seem to have been written under the influence of the romances of antiquity and from which the knight-errantry of the Breton romances is absent, see G. Paris, Litt. fr. §§ 65–71, Mediaeval French Lit. pp. 70–73; Petit de Julleville and Saintsbury, as noted above.

D. *Epical Romances: l'Épopée Courtoise.* The romances of this division are largely of Celtic-Breton derivation, and the variations in subject and poetic conception as compared with the other materials of French epical romance afford striking problems of analysis, comparison, and classification. With the epical romances of Arthurian themes the student should compare the contemporary lyric of *courtoisie*, already noticed (see above, § 6, VII, B). He should note, also, the remarks on the relation of the metrical romances to the national epic that occur below (XI, C; IX, D).

References. Only works of general importance, relating to all the cycles, can be mentioned here. For detailed bibliography of the various cycles and individual poems, see in the following list the works by G. Paris (Litt. fr. au moyen âge, pp. 293–297), Petit de Julleville, and Ward. Representative studies are: A. C. L. Brown, Iwain, a Study in the Origins of Arthurian Romance (Boston: 1903; in [Harvard] Studies and Notes in Philology and Literature, vol. VIII); C. V. Langlois, La société franç. au XIII^{e} siècle d'après dix romans d'aventure (Paris: 1904); G. de La Rue (see above, under B); A. Nutt, Studies on the Legend of the Holy Grail (Lond.: 1888); W. A. Nitze, The Old French Grail Romance, Perlesvaus, etc. (Baltimore: 1902), a good example in English of the modern monographs upon the various French romances; G. Paris, Litt. fr. au moyen âge, §§ 53–71; P. Paris, Les romans de la table ronde (5 vols. Paris: 1868–77), and Gaston Paris, the same, in vol. XXX of the Hist. litt. de la France (Paris: 1888); Petit de Julleville, vol. I, pp. 254–344, with the bibliography of the most important works on pp. 340–344; G. Saintsbury, The

Flourishing of Romance, Chap. III, pp. 86–147; Villemarqué, Les romans de la table ronde et les contes des anciens Bretons (Paris: 1859); H. L. D. Ward, Catalogue of Romances in the Department of Manuscripts in the British Museum (2 vols. Lond.: 1883–93). See further Betz-Baldensperger, La litt. comparée, essai bibliographique, pp. 22–31 (Strasbourg: 1904).

E. *Later French Epics.* Aside from the metrical romances, the student should notice, as also belonging to the close of the Middle Ages, the animal-epic of Reynard (ed. by E. Martin, Le Roman de Renard, Strasbourg and Paris, 1882–1885), the Roman de la Rose, and various religious and didactic poems. See the works of Aubertin, G. Paris, Gautier, Lanson, already mentioned; and J. Bédier, Les fabliaux, études de litt. populaire et de l'histoire litt. du moyen âge (Paris: 1895); L. Sudre, Les sources du Roman de Renart (Paris: 1893); the masterly and definitive comparative study of Reynard literature by Lucien Foulet, Le Roman de Renard (Paris: 1914. See under Foulet, § 11, above); E. Langlois, Origines et sources du Roman de la Rose (Paris: 1891). In the sixteenth century should be noted Ronsard's Franciade (see A. Binet, Vie de Pierre Ronsard, in Archives curieuses de l'hist. de France, Paris: 1834–40; and the Œuvres de Ronsard, — ed. Marty-Laveaux, Paris: 1857–67, — and in Bibl. Elzév., Paris: 1857–67) and Du Bartas' Judith and La Sepmaine, ou la création en sept journées, — poems of the new 'classical' tendencies represented by the Pléiade (see G. Pellissier, La vie et les œuvres de Du Bartas, Paris: 1883; P. Weller, J. Sylvester's englische Uebersetzung d. relig. Epen d. Du Bartas, 1902; A. H. Upham, French Influence in Eng. Lit., Chap. IV, N.Y.: 1908; and Du Bartas' Œuvres, Paris: 1593). On Ronsard and Du Bartas see Tilley, Lit. of the French Renaissance. At this point the imitation of the classical epics takes the place of the more native and original attempts we have heretofore noticed. In the next century this imitative rage achieved its climax of tiresome artificiality in Le Moyne's Saint-Louis, Desmarets de Saint-Sorlin's Clovis, Scudéry's Alaric, the Charlemagne of Louis le Laboureur, Perrault's Saint-Paulin, and Chapelain's La Pucelle d'Orléans (see Finsler, Homer in der Neuzeit, pp. 157–163, 174–175; J. Duchesne, Histoire des poèmes épiques français du 17^{e} siècle, Paris: 1870; R. Reumann, Georges de Scudéry als Epiker, Diss. Leipz.: 1911). These gradually gave way to the prose romances of La Calprenède, Madeleine Scudéry, etc. To the same century belong the burlesque epics of Paul Scarron (Virgile travesti) and Boileau (Le lutrin); and at the close of the century appeared Fénelon's prose epic, Télémaque. To the following century belong Marmontel's translation of the Pharsalia, and Voltaire's Henriade. The pseudo-epics of the Empire may be represented by the Philippe-Auguste of Parseval de Grandmaison; for others, see the works of Dumesnil, Campenon, and Luce de Lancival. In the nineteenth century also belong the Jocelyn and La chute d'un ange of Lamartine, and Hugo's La légende des siècles. For the bibliography of these later epics the student is referred to the histories of French literature listed below in the Appendix.

VI. **Italian Epics.**

Included in the series Storia dei generi letterari italiani are two helpful works, — F. Foffano's Il poema cavalleresco (Milano: 1904) and A. Belloni's Il poema epico e mitologico (1911 ?). Of the aid offered by the various histories of Italian literature the student should avail himself largely. These histories, with an indication of their relative importance, are listed in the Appendix; but it may be said here that the student who cannot read Italian will find excellent aid in the history in German by Gaspary and its English translation by Oelsner (consult vol. II of the German ed. of 1884, Chap. XX Chivalrous Poetry, Pulci and Boiardo; XXIV Ariosto; XXVIII Heroic Poetry in the Sixteenth Century; and vol. I for Dante), and in the history in French by Hauvette (1906). The histories of Sismondi (trans. by Roscoe) and Symonds present valuable insights. Garnett's is brief but admirable. None of the following is of much value: L. Frigeri, Principii della nuova epopea italiana (Mantova: 1879); D. Giovanni, Della poesia epica in Italia nel secoli XVI e XVII (in *Eff. Sic.*, May–June, 1876); A. Graf, Epopea in Italia (in his Letture per le giovinette. V, fasc. 2). The student of literary movements in relation to cultural conditions will find very suggestive F. Loise's Histoire de la poésie mise en rapport avec la civilisation en Italie (Bruxelles: 1895). The same student will naturally require the aid of general histories of the Renaissance in Italy, inasmuch as the work of Boiardo, Ariosto, and Tasso falls into relation with that period. He will find a bibliography of such histories in Körting (Encykl. 1886. 3: 698–699). Especially helpful are J. Burckhardt's Die Cultur der Renaissance in Italien (3d ed. Leipz.: 1877), E. Gebhart's Les origines de la Renaissance en Italie (Paris: 1879), W. Pater's The Renaissance (suggestive and subjective, appreciative), Symonds' Renaissance in Italy (see above, § 8), and the masterly work of G. Voigt, Die Wiederbelebung des classischen Alterthums oder das erste Jahrh. des Humanismus (2 vols. 3d ed. Berlin: 1893). Further references of a general sort are listed at the head of VIII in § 6, above.

A. *Dante.*

For bibliographical aids see Colomb de Batines, Bibliografia dantesca (Prato: 1845–48); G. J. Ferrazzi, Manuale dantesco (5 vols. Bassano: 1863–77); J. Petzholdt, Bibliographia Dantea (2d ed. Dresden: 1880); Körting, Encykl., 3: 716–719 (1886). For a full and modern bibliography the student cannot do better than consult G. A. Scartazzini's Prolegomeni della Divina Commedia (Leipz.: 1890), his Dante-Handbuch (Leipz.: 1892. English trans. by A. J. Butler, A Companion to Dante. Lond.: 1893), and his Dantologia (Milano: 1894). See also T. W. Koch, Catalogue of the Dante Collection presented by W. Fiske (2 vols. Pt. I Dante's Works; Pt. II Works on Dante. Ithaca, N.Y.: 1898–1900); W. C. Lane, catalogues of the Dante collections of Harvard University and the Boston Public Library. For Dante dictionaries, see D. G. Poletto, Dizionario dantesco, etc. (7 vols. Sienna: 1885+); P. Toynbee, A Dictionary of Proper Names and Notable Matters in the Works of Dante (Oxford: 1898, 1914). An indispensable aid to the study of Dante, containing much bibliography under various heads, is G. A. Scartazzini's Enciclopedia dantesca, Dizionario critica e ragionata di quanto concerne la vita e le opere di Dante Alighieri (3 vols. 3d vol. by A. Fiammazzo. Milano: 1896–1905). A concordance to all the works has been prepared by E. A. Fay (Cambridge, Mass.: 1888; Lond.: 1894).

For the English reader the best introduction to Dante as the embodiment of the Middle Ages, as social, political, philosophical, and religious thinker, spokesman of the medieval temper and poet of the Divine

Comedy, is C. H. Grandgent's Dante (Master Spirits of Literature Series. N. Y.: 1916). Other excellent brief introductions in English to the study of Dante, and to the study of the studies of Dante, are Scartazzini's scholarly Companion to Dante, noted above; the popular Introduction to the Study of Dante by J. A. Symonds (4th ed. Lond.: 1906); A. J. Butler's Dante, his Times and Work (Lond.: 1895); and E. G. Gardner's Dante (in the Temple Primer Series. Lond.: 1900). For a more extensive introduction, see the reference under F. X. Kraus, below. R. W. Church's Dante, An Essay (1878) and M. F. Rossetti's A Shadow of Dante (1884) are helpful interpretations of Dante's thought, temper, and art. For readers of Italian and French F. Flamini's Avviamento allo studio della D. C. (Livorno: 1909) and H. Hauvette's Dante, introduction à l'étude de la D. C. (Paris: 1911) are valuable.

The Divina Commedia offers many interesting problems to the student of epic literature. In its nature, apocalyptic and autobiographical, — in its form, narrative, — in its interpretative requirement, literal, allegorical, moral, anagogical, — it is so original as compared with the epics of antiquity, and yet so brought into relation with them by Dante's use of Virgil as a source of poetic inspiration and as a chief character in the poem itself, that the student finds himself confronted with a most striking variation in poetic type-development. Indeed, one who is still hypnotized by the old 'rule-giving' poetics and by the conception of the literary type as static will forthwith deny the title of epic to this strange poem. Thus A. J. Butler writes:

> The Commedia, though often classed for want of a better description among epic poems, is totally different in method and construction from all other poems of that kind. Its "hero" is the narrator himself; the incidents do not modify the course of the story; the place of episodes is taken by theological or metaphysical disquisitions; the world through which the poet takes his readers is peopled, not with characters of heroic story, but with men and women known personally or by repute to him and those for whom he wrote. Its aim is not to delight, but to reprove, to rebuke, to exhort; to form men's characters by teaching them what courses of life will meet with reward, what with penalty, hereafter; "to put into verse," as the poet says, "things difficult to think" (Art. Dante, Encyc. Brit.).

Such criticism will seem to many even more retrospective than Addison's.

On the other hand, those who believe that variation in type is the dynamics of literary development will make light of Butler's cruxes. The scientific student will at once observe that widely as this poem differs from the great epics of the past it still derives in no slight degree from them, and is in line with certain characteristics of epic tradition as modified by Latin Christianity. He will, with combined feelings of relief and curiosity, indulge the hypothesis that in the Divine Comedy the epic type develops in a new and distinct direction — is, in short, reshaped, revivified — while it still performs its peculiar function. The day of Roman copying of the epic forms and ideas of a dead civilization was transcended. A new civilization, that of medieval Christian Europe, had perpetuated its spiritual character in a form that necessarily and characteristically varied from the older forms. The student must be at pains to show how in this particular instance the variation of form grew up, why it was necessary, and in what way it was the characteristic expression of the new age. No such entirely new problem has been so far encountered in this conspectus of the theory and history of the epic. In studying the Roman epics criticism is concerned with modifications of an older type still cherished with respectful conservatism. With the Divina Commedia the type has been abandoned altogether, or it has entered upon an entirely new stage of development, even if none but Dante was capable of achievement. That not a few authorities are of this opinion will appear from the discussion in § 7, 1, above, and the References in § 8.

There are, of course, those who hold that the difficulties in the way of recognizing this hypothesis are insuperable. For them nothing remains but the older premises and the older style of criticism. If, however, we assume for the moment that the new point of view is at any rate worthy of consideration, — that Dante has discovered such a way of writing an epic poem that he is not limited to the presentations of history or tradition, but draws upon his most peculiar and subtle intellectual experiences, — interesting questions present themselves for solution: How does it happen that a poem so created, lacking the objectivity and traditional character which render the 'folk epic' the idealized expression of the society of its day, does nevertheless just as adequately perform the epic function for the society of the fourteenth century in Europe? Or is the Commedia more restricted in its social scope than was the Iliad, or even the Aeneid? Is it concerned with spiritual matters to the exclusion of political, moral to the exclusion of military? One who has read the poem will scarcely answer in the affirmative. There is a host of questions to be disposed of before one can, with the dignity of real knowledge, pronounce upon these matters. It must be clear to the thinking student that, in spite of all that has been written upon Dante, an adequate study of his epic in the spirit of comparative inquiry has yet to be made.

The more specific problems in the historical study of the Divina Commedia lie in determining (1) the relation of the poem to previous Christian Latin literature of (*a*) knowledge, including science and Roman Catholic philosophy and theology, (*b*) vision and mysticism, involving a comparison with non-Christian visions of the other world, and (*c*) didacticism, ethical and religious; (2) the relation of the poem to ancient, especially Roman classical and post-classical, literature; (3) the relation to troubadour (Provençal) poetry of love; and (4) the relation to contemporary politics. The allegorical character of the poem is also to be compared with the allegorical method as practised in the several classes of literature just noted. For Christian Latin literature see above, IV, and § 6, IV–VI; for troubadour poetry, above, V, and § 6, VII.

Editions. The *editio princeps* is that of Foligno, etc. (1472). The four oldest editions have been reprinted by Lord Vernon and Panizzi (Le prime quattro edizioni della Divina Commedia letteralmente ristampate. Lond.: 1858). The first Aldine ed. appeared in 1502. G. A. Scartazzini's great scholarly edition, with the 'Leipzig Commentary,' appeared at Leipzig between 1874 and 1890 — rev. ed., by G. Vandelli, 1911. A. Lubin's edition was published in 1881. A convenient edition is that of A. J. Butler, The Hell, Purgatory, Paradise of D. A., edited with prose translations and notes (3 vols. Lond.: 1885 etc.). Casini's edition, with his valuable commentary, is available in the 5th ed. (Firenze: 1895; rev. ed., 1903). See also Ricci's edition (Milano: 1897) and Tommaso Casini's (Firenze: 1903). A readily obtainable edition, with English prose translation facing the Italian text, is that in the Temple Classics Series (ed. by Oelsner; translations by Carlyle, Okey, and Wicksteed. 3 vols. Lond.: 1899). The editions and commentaries of Fraticelli and Bianchi are rather antiquated. The best complete edition of the entire works of Dante is the 'Oxford Dante' (Tutte le opere di D. A., nuovamente rivedute nel testo dal Dr. E. Moore. 3 vols. Oxford: 1894 and 1897; 3d ed., 1904), or C. H. Grandgent's, rev. ed., 1913.

Translations. (*a*) English: In general, on earlier translations into English, see P. Toynbee, English Translations of Dante, 14th to 17th centuries (in *Journal of Comparative Literature*, 1: 345–365), and a similar article covering the translations of the 18th century (in *Mod. Lang. Rev.*, 1: 9–24). The chief translations of the 19th century are those of H. Boyd, in verse (1802), Cary, in verse (1814: The Vision, 1913, repr. Everyman's Library; The Divine Comedy, rev. ed. 1914), J. A. Carlyle, the Inferno, in prose (1849), I. C. Wright, in verse (4th ed. 1857), Longfellow, in verse (1867+), Plumptre, in verse (1886–87), J. A. Wilstach (1888), Norton, in prose (1892), Tozer, in prose (1904), C. G. Wright, Purgatorio, in verse (1905), and H. Johnson, in verse (Yale Univ. Press). The student of metrical effect will be interested in Musgrave's translation of the Inferno in the Spenserian stanza, and in Hazelfoot's use of the terza rima. Very convenient editions for practical use are those of Butler, and Oelsner (Temple Classics Series), mentioned above. (*b*) French: the translation of Lammenais is standard. (*c*) German: King John of Saxony (1839–49), Blanc (1864), Eitner (1865), C. Witte (1865), Bachenschwanz (1867–69), Notter (1873), Bartsch, which is the best for the student (1877).

References. From the almost endless number of works upon Dante and the Commedia, the following are selected as of especial importance to the student of the epic: G. Agnelli, Topocorografia del viaggio dantesco (Milano: 1891); Brother Azarias, Spiritual Sense of the Divina Commedia (in his Phases of Thought and Criticism, 1892); K. Borinski, Ueber poetische Vision und Imagination, ein historisch-psychologischer Versuch anlässlich Dantes (Halle: 1897), a brilliant piece of psychological analysis that will be of indirect aid to the historical student; W. B. Carpenter, The Spiritual Message of Dante (Harvard Univ. Press); V. Capetti, L'anima e l'arte di Dante (Livorno: 1907); D. Comparetti, Virgil in the Middle Ages (trans. by E. F. M. Benecke. Lond.: 1908; see Pt. I, Chaps. XIV–XV); A. Counson, Dante en France (in *Roman. Forsch.*, 21: 1. 1908); M. Dods, Forerunners of Dante (Edinb.: 1903), an account, popular, not exhaustive, of some of the more important visions of the unseen world, from Gilgamesh to St. Christina (compare above, IV, E): on the originality of Dante's vision, see F. Cancellieri, Osservazioni sopra l' originalità della D. C. di Dante (Roma: 1814), which Dods calls the first serious assailant of Dante's originality; see also similar works by Ozanam and Labitte, and an answer by Ugo Foscolo in the *Edinb. Rev.*, 30: Sept. 1818; A. Farinelli, Dante e la Francia dall' età media al secolo di Voltaire (Milano: 1908); K. Federn, Dante and his Time (Lond.: 1902); F. Flamini, I significati reconditi della Commedia di Dante (2 vols. Livorno: 1903–04); U. Foscolo, Discorso sul testo della Commedia di Dante (in the author's Opere, vol. III, p. 87 ff. 1825); E. G. Gardner, Dante and the Mystics (Lond.: 1913); R. Garnett, History of Italian Literature (N. Y.: 1900), which, within a small space (see Chap. IV), contains so much that is valuable and stimulating that it may be mentioned here as well as above; C. H. Grandgent, Dante and St. Paul (in *Romania*, 31: 14. 1902); W. T. Harris, Spiritual Sense of Dante's D. C.; F. Hettinger, Dante's D. C., its Scope and Value (trans. by H. S. Bowden. Lond.: 1887), Roman Catholic point of view, inaccurate, yet useful; G. P. Huntington, Comments of John Ruskin on the Divina Commedia (Boston: 1903); F. X. Kraus, Dante, sein Leben und sein Werk, sein Verhältniss zur Kunst und zur Politik (Berlin: 1897), — a monumental work, which, if taken in conjunction with Scartazzini's Dizionario, furnishes the advanced student with a very thorough apparatus for approaching the study of Dante: see notice of Kraus above, § 9; L. O. Kuhns, Treatment of Nature in Dante (Lond.: 1897), and by the same, Dante and the English Poets (N. Y.: 1904), — both very light and superficial; E. Moore, Contributions to the Textual Criticism of the D. C. (Cambridge: 1889); by the same, Dante and his early Biographers (Lond.: 1890); by the same, Studies in Dante (3 vols. Oxford: 1896–1903), — Professor Moore is one of the leading authorities for the study of Dante; L. F. Mott, Dante and Beatrice (1892); G. Negri, Ed., Arte, scienza e fede ai giorni di Dante (Milano: 1901); Oelsner, Influence of Dante on Modern Thought (1895); several works by F. D' Ovidio, which can be easily found in any good Dante collection; Ozanam, Dante et la philosophie catholique (1845); W. H. V. Reade, The Moral System of Dante's Inferno (Oxford: 1909); L. Rocca, Di alcuni commenti della D. C. composti nei primi vent'anni dopo la morte di Dante (Firenze: 1891); D. G. Rossetti, Dante and his Circle (Lond.: 1892); G. Saintsbury, Dante and the Grand Style (in Essays and Studies by Members of the English Association, vol. III, 1912); G. Santayana, Three Philosophical Poets (in Harvard Studies in Comparative Literature. Vol. I. Cambridge: 1901); F. W. J. von Schelling (see p. 686 of the work cited above, § 8); E. C. Stedman, The Nature and Elements of Poetry (see above, § 8); P. Toynbee, Dante in English Literature from Chaucer to Cary (2 vols. N.Y.: 1909), a far more valuable book than that by Kuhns mentioned above; H. F. Tozer, An English Commentary on the D. C. (Lond.: 1901); K. Vossler, Die göttliche Komödie, Entwickelungsgeschichte und Erklärung (2 vols. in 4. Heidelberg: 1907–10); P. H. Wicksteed, Dante, Six Sermons; C. Witte, Essays on Dante, etc. (Lond.: 1898); N. Zingarelli, Dante (in Storia letteraria d' Italia. Milano: n. d.). Much of varied value of a critical nature will be found in the several periodicals devoted to the study of Dante: see the *Bullettino della Società Dantesca Italiana* (ed. by M. Barbi), the *Dante Society Reports* (1882 +), the *Giornale Dantesco* (ed. by Count G. L. Passerini), and the *Jahrbuch der deutschen Dante-Gesellschaft* (4 vols. Leipz.: 1867–77). The *Nation* (N. Y.) always contains careful reviews of the chief works on Dante as they appear. For references on the influence of Dante upon the various European literatures, see Betz-Baldensperger, La littérature comparée, essai bibliographique (2d ed. Strasbourg: 1904), p. 161 ff.

B. *Petrarch*, *Boccaccio*, *and the Humanists.* During the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries the resuscitation of the classics bore in various ways upon the development of the epic. In 1339, two years before his coronation as laureate marked the opening of the Renaissance, the greatest of the humanists, Petrarch, had produced in Latin hexameters his epic of Scipio Africanus, entitled Africa. Some thirty years later, under the patronage of Petrarch and Boccaccio, Leo Pilatus manufactured from the Greek the first complete Latin version of the Iliad and the Odyssey (in prose; see *Romania*, 29: 403 ff. 1900). Poggio Bracciolini (1380–1459), by his exhumation of Silius Italicus and Valerius Flaccus, contributed to the movement texts for critical and comparative study. The example of Petrarch in the construction of original Latin poetry was followed, but after a long interval, by Francesco Filelfo (1398–1481), who in his adulatory and in part satirical poem, the Sforziade, written primarily in honor of Francesco Sforza, aimed to produce a modern Iliad. The poem, like others of its kind, "was still-born, but it possessed some of the characteristics of new Italian literature." Filelfo's younger contemporary, Basinio Basini, indited a similar Latin heroic poem in laudation of Sigismondo Malatesta. A Latin translation of part of the Iliad was made by the great humanist and critic Laurentius Valla (1407–57). A much finer translation in Latin hexameters, begun by Marsuppini, was carried in 1470 through four more books by the sixteen-year-old genius, Angelo Poliziano, — friend of Lorenzo de' Medici, and teacher of humanism to the schoolmasters of Europe. These are but a few indications of classical influences which, both in detail and full scope, offer to the student a most interesting field of investigation.

In Italian, meanwhile, the geographical epic, Dittamondo, of Fazio degli Uberti, and the moral Quadriregio of Frezzi, both of the fourteenth century, exemplify the uninspired and tiresome imitation of Dante. The epic parts of Petrarch's Trionfi, on the other hand, — a poem written just before the laureate's death (1374), — display in mature development the qualities of sad sincerity and sublimity prophesied by the youthful Africa, and are food for study in the historical investigation of the course of epic poetry. As influencing the career of religious allegory the poem has been the subject of numerous theses. Of the same century were Boccaccio's Teseide (1341) — the first Italian heroic-romantic epic, the first, also, to employ the *ottava rima*, of which Tasso and Ariosto were to make use — and his Filostrato (1344–50). On the former poem Chaucer drew for his Knight's Tale, on the latter for his Troilus. To the fifteenth century belong the parodies of the poetry of chivalry, beginning with the Ciriffo Calvaneo of Luca Pulci and providing the earliest masterpiece of *epopea* *cavallaresca* in the ironic romantic epic of Roland, his paladins, his foes, and his loyal giant, — the Morgante Maggiore (1460–82) of Luigi Pulci.

On the Morgante, see the following: L. Einstein, L. Pulci and the Morgante Maggiore (in *Litterarhist. Forsch.*, No. 22. 1902); J. Hübscher, on the sources (edition of the anonymous Orlando), in Stengel's *Ausgaben und Abhandlungen*, No. LX (Marburg: 1886); F. Foffano, Il Morgante di L. P. (Torino: 1891); by the same, Il disegno del Morgante (in *Giorn. storico*, 16: 368); P. Rajna, Arts. in the *Propugnatore* during the years 1869 and 1871, on the sources; B. Sanvisenti, L' Astarotte viaggiatore nel Pulci e un suo probabile fonte (in *Biblioth. delle scuole ital.*, 8: 13; cf. Rajna in *Rassegna bibliog.*, 8: 1); R. Truffi, Di una probabile fonte del Margutte (in *Giorn. stor.*, 22: 200); G. Volpi, Note critiche sul Morgante (Modena: 1894); by the same, an Art. in the *Giorn. storico*, 1890, p. 361 ff.; by the same, the edition in three volumes (Firenze: 1900–1904). For general works on the Orlando 'matter,' see below, under Ariosto. — On the Ciriffo, see the reprint by E. Audin (Firenze: 1834), and L. Mattioli, Luca Pulci e il Ciriffo (Padova: 1900).

C. *Boiardo.*

For general works on the history of the Orlando legend, see below, under Ariosto.

The student of the epic is fortunate in having at hand for the study of the development of the type from national to artificial and literary stages a group of poems like the Chanson de Roland, the Orlando Innamorato of Boiardo, the Orlando Furioso of Ariosto, and many intermediate forms. Stages of change or variation in form, content, and method of composition may aptly be traced from the French originals of the Roland legend through various early adaptations by Italian minstrels and poets until we come to Pulci, Boiardo, and Ariosto. The student should endeavor to measure these variations and to determine at what point or in what way the romantic Italian epics vary so much and so characteristically from the Chanson de Roland and other so-called 'folk epics' that they should be denominated a sub-type or separate type, — the romances of chivalry (cf. P. Rajna, Fonti dell' Orlando

Furioso, 2d ed., p. 18, and the discussion of the question by Italian critics of the Renaissance, noted above, § 9). A complete understanding of the differences in form and selection of material of these French epical and Italian romantic poems would afford no little insight into the laws that govern epical growth and decay. Zumbini's work, mentioned below (under Ariosto), and Gröber's Grundriss are of aid in suggesting the materials, and a few of the particular problems, of such a study as that implied. — Furthermore, the imitation by Boiardo and Tasso of the classical epic brings into view another major force in the development of the type.

Editions and Translations. The first complete edition of the Orlando Innamorato appeared in 1495. Berni's *rifacimento* of the original text destroys much of its value, especially for the student. The best editions are those of A. Panizzi (Lond.: 1830), Stiavelli (Roma: 1894), and F. Foffano (3 vols., Bologna: 1906–07). *Translations:* An English translation of three books, in verse, was made by R. T[oft] in 1598; the prose version of W. S. Rose was made from Berni's *rifacimento*, and contains some portions in the verse form of the original (Edinb. and Lond.: 1823). There exist a French prose version by F. de Rosset (Paris: 1619), the well-known, freely altered version by Le Sage, — Roland l'amoureux (1716), — and an extract by Comte de Trissan (Paris: 1804). For German translations, see those of Gries (Stuttgart: 1835–39) and Regis (Berlin: 1840).

References. There are comparatively few references on Boiardo. His life is written by A. Panizzi, in the second vol. of Panizzi's edition of the Orlando Innamorato di Bojardo: Orlando Furioso di Ariosto (9 vols. Lond.: 1830–34). For the essay in the first vol., see above, § 11. The commentary of G. Stiavelli (Roma: 1894) is valuable. Essays by G. Ferrari, P. Rajna, A. Luzio, C. Tincani, and others, dealing with various aspects of the poem, are contained in the Studi su M. M. Boiardo (ed. by N. Campanini. Bologna: 1894). See also G. Albini, M. M. Boiardo (in *Nuova antol.*, 142); G. Bertoni, Nuovi studi su M. M. Boiardo (Bologna: 1904); P. Rajna, L'Orlando Innamorato del Boiardo (in Vita italiana del Rinascimento, Milano: 1899); G. Razzoli, Per le fonti dell' Orl. Innam. (Milano: 1901; cf. *Giorn. stor.*, 40: 223); G. Searles, Boiardo's Orl. Innam. und seine Beziehungen zur altfranzösischen erzählenden Dichtung (Leipz.: 1901; cf. *Giorn. stor.*, 39: 155). Other references in D'Ancona and Bacci, Manuale, II, 2d ed., 149, note.

D. *Ariosto.*

For bibliography, see G. B. Bolza, Manuale ariostesco (Venezia: 1868); G. J. Ferrazzi, Bibliografia ariostesca (Bassano: 1881); Körting, Encykl., 3: 706 (1886); also G. Melzi, Bibliografia dei romanzi cavallereschi italiani (Milano: 1865), for continuations of the Orlando Furioso. — On the origin and development of the Roland legend see the works of G. Paris, P. Rajna, K. Nyrop, and L. Gautier mentioned above under V, A; also F. Castets, Recherches sur les rapports des chansons de geste et de l'épopée chevaleresque italienne (in *Rev. des langues romanes*, 27 ff.; cf. *Romania*, 15: 626, 17: 145); V. Crescini, Orlando nella Chanson de Roland e nei poemi del Bojardo e dell' Ariosto (Bologna: 1880); G. Ferrario, Storia ed analisi degli antichi romanzi di cavalleria (Milano: 1829); F. Foffano, Rinaldo da Montalbano nella letteratura romanzesca italiana (Venezia: 1891); by the same, Il poema cavalleresco (Milano: 1904, being vol. II of Storia dei generi letterari italiani); H. Morf, Vom Rolandslied zum Orlando Furioso (in *Deutsche Rundschau*, June, 1898; reprinted in Aus Dichtung und Sprache der Romanen, Strassburg: 1903); P. Rajna, Uggieri il Danese nella lett. romanzesca degli Italiani (in *Romania*, 2, 3, 4); by the same, Ricerche intorno ai Reali di Francia (Bologna: 1872; cf. G. Paris in *Romania*, 7). J. D. M. and Mary A. Ford's Romances of Chivalry in Italian Verse, selections edited with introduction and notes (N.Y.: 1904), may be mentioned as a brief introductory survey in English.

With Ariosto's Orlando Furioso, fairly complete by 1508, one of the most splendid creations of the Renaissance, — not burlesque but smiling and artistic, more seriously conceived and more classically modelled than the Innamorato, — the fantastic epic of chivalry attains its flower.

On the whole, then, the tendency toward seriousness was decidedly strong in Ariosto, and necessarily so, since he was seeking to bring the medieval romance of chivalry into the category of the classic epic, with which the revival of learning had acquainted the modern world. The trend was toward the genuine epic now, and was to continue that way until Tasso's Gerusalemme Liberata could become a fact. Ariosto's striving to reach the goal is obvious in his intentional and felicitous combination of elements from the ancient classic world with those from the medieval world of Charlemagne and Arthur inherited by him. Classic is the title of his work, which certainly harks back to the Hercules Furens of Seneca; so is the purpose which he unfolds at the outset; and so is his invocation. As Virgil exalted the *Gens Julia*, so he celebrates the race of Este, which, to be sure, Boiardo had already begun to flatter. The nuptials of Aeneas and Lavinia suggested to him those of Ruggiero and Bradamante. The position of Roland is . . . that of the Achilles of the Iliad: the death of Rodomonte parallels that of Turnus. In the numerous episodes, too, ancient classic story revives, as is instanced by the exposure to the sea-monster of Angelica and Olympia, by the base desertion of the latter, and by the expedition of Cloridano and Medoro (Ford, as cited, xxxii–xxxiii).

Among the imitations of Ariosto's Orlando Furioso were Luigi Alamanni's Girone il Cortese (1548) and Bernardo Tasso's Amadigi (publ. 1560); for others, see Garnett, p. 153. Among the parodies were the Orlandino of Aretino, and a poem of the same name (1526) by Teofilo Folengo.

Editions and Translations. The *editio princeps* of the Orlando Furioso was published at Ferrara, 1516; see the editions of Molini (1821), Panizzi (Lond.: 1830), Gioberti (1846), Camerini (1869; 10th ed., 1900), Casella (1877 +), Romizi (1901), Papini (1903). — *Translations:* English, by Sir John Harington (Lond.: 1633–34), J. Hoole (1807), W. S. Rose (Bohn's Lib. 1823); French, by M. A. Mauzy (1839), C. Hippeau (1880), F. Reynard (1880); German, by W. Heinse (1782), Gries (1804–09), Streckfuss (1818 +), Gildemeister (1883).

References. The following works will be of aid: J. B. Bolza, Ariost's Nachahmung der Alten (in *Jahrb. für roman. und engl. Lit.*, 4: 16 ff. 1862); R. W. Bond, Ariosto (in *Quart. Rev.*, 208: 125–154); G. Carducci, Su Ludovico Ariosto e Torquato Tasso (in the author's Opere, vol. XV. 20 vols. Bologna: 1889–1909); by the same, the Prefazione to the edition of the O. F. illustrated by G. Doré (Milano: 1899); G. A. Cesareo, La fantasia dell' Ariosto (in his Critica Militante, Messina: 1907); V. Crescini, Orlando nella Chanson de Roland e nei poemi del Bojardo e dell' Ariosto (Bologna: 1880); R. E. N. Dodge, Spenser's Imitations from Ariosto (in *Pubs. Mod. Lang. Ass.*, 1897); L. Donati, L' Ariosto e il Tasso giudicati dal Voltaire (Halle: 1889), cf. G. Carducci, L' Ariosto e il Voltaire (in Opere, vol. X, p. 129 ff.); W. Everett, The Italian Poets since Dante (N.Y.: 1904); F. Flamini, Il Cinquecento, p. 65 ff., bibliography pp. 533–534; E. G. Gardner, The King of Court Poets, A Study of the Work, Life and Times of L. Ariosto (Lond.: 1906); W. von Humboldt, Über Goethe's Hermann und Dorothea, §§ xxi–xxvi (see above, § 8); L. O. Kuhns, The Great Poets of Italy (Boston: 1903); by the same, Some Verbal Resemblances in the O. F. and the Divine Comedy (in *Mod. Lang. Notes*, 10); G. Maruffi, La Divina Commedia considerata quale fonte dell' Orlando Furioso e della Gerusalemme Liberata (Napoli: 1903); L. de Monge (see above, § 8); H. Morf, Vom Rolandslied zum Orlando Furioso (in *Deutsche Rundschau*, June, 1898); A. Piumati, La vita e le opere di L. Ariosto (Torino: 1886); E. Proto, Spigolature ariostesche (in E. Pèrcopo's *Studi di lett. ital.*, Napoli: 1903, and in *Rassegna crit. della lett. ital.*, XIII, 145–159); P. Rajna, Le fonti dell' O. F. (Firenze: 1876; 2d ed., 1900), a very valuable and scholarly work; A. Romizi, Le fonti latine dell' O. F. (Torino: 1896); F. W. J. von Schelling (p. 669 of the work cited above, § 8); A. W. Schlegel (vol. XIII, pp. 243–288, of the Sämmtliche Werke. Ed. by E. Böcking. Leipz.: 1847); A. Scrocca, Saggio critico sull' O. F. (Napoli: 1889); A. Volta, Storia poetica di Orlando studiata in sei poemi (Bologna: 1894); B. Zumbini, La pazzia d' Orlando (in *Studi di lett. ital.*, Firenze: 1894).

E. *Tasso.*

For bibliography, see Körting, Encykl., 3: 743–746 (1886), and various works and articles by A. Solerti, noticed by Flamini (see below), p. 580.

The classical inspiration had meanwhile evinced itself in such poems as the Latin epic of Vida, the Christias (1535), and in a classicizing failure at an epic by Trissino, the Italia Liberata (1547–48) — the first Italian epic in blank verse. In 1562, the eighteen-year-old Torquato Tasso attempted in his Rinaldo to reduce the romantic presuppositions and chaotic episodes of chivalry to Aristotelian rules of unity and action, but with little success, for the material did not lend itself to serious treatment. With his Gerusalemme Liberata, of which the first copy was finished in 1575, he achieved, however, a serious poem of romantic subject in lofty and classical style — the best heroic of Italy.

Since the Gerusalemme Liberata is on the one hand a romance of chivalry, and on the other a classical and heroic epic, some questions may here be asked concerning its relation to both these kinds, and concerning the poetic presuppositions and limitations of chivalry as an institution.

Is the relation of Tasso's masterpiece to the verse-romances homologous with that of the Iliad to earlier minstrel lays, or with that of the Chanson de Roland to its popular forerunners? In what respects is the Gerusalemme a variation of the type of epic established by Boiardo and Ariosto? Is such variation purely a matter of the idiosyncrasy of the author, or has it any significant relation to the character of the times? What elements of story-material and mode of conception and poetic expression differentiate this poem from the ancient epic? How may the presence of such elements be shown as natural and inevitable in view of the nature of the civilization of the Renaissance? Can such elements be regarded as constant, essential, differencing elements of the Renaissance epic as a whole? What of the epic character of the institution of chivalry? Is its military basis a bond of unity with the military character of the ancient epic? Is its moral equivocacy a sophistication of the moral crudity of the communal epic? Does it necessarily involve the romantic epic in a variation that leads to a loss of vitality in the type? Is the *courtoisie* of chivalry an element that saps rather than increases the energy of the epic as a literary growth? What relation has the unwieldy, episodical nature of the romantic epic to the confused and indeterminate, complex Renaissance genius? Is the earlier *epopea cavalleresca* of the Italians the acme and close of the spiritual period that it expresses? or is Tasso's heroic and more classical epic of romance? Is either at all comparable in this respect to the Homeric epic? Has the influence of either on the further development of the epic been comparable to that of the ancient epics?

Editions and Translations. The revised and authorized edition of the Gerusalemme Liberata appeared at Parma, in 1581. For unauthorized editions, etc., see U. Guidi, Annali delle edizioni e delle versioni della G. L. e d'altri lavori al poema relativi (Bologna: 1868). The best modern edition is by A. Solerti and coadjutors (3 vols. Firenze: 1895–96); others by Ferrari (1890), Camerini (1898), Carbone (1870). — For a list of *translations* into various languages, see G. J. Ferrazzi, Torquato Tasso (1880), p. 330 ff. The standard English translation is that of Fairfax (1600; ed. by Henry Morley, 1889). There is an earlier translation by Richard Carew of Antony (1594). For 16th-century translations, see E. Koeppel in *Anglia*, 11: 333. 1889; 12: 103. 1890; 13: 42. 1891. J. H. Wiffen's translation (1824–25; new ed., 1883) is important; see also versions by C. L. Smith (1876–79) and Sir John Kingston James (1884). Translations of parts were made by H. Hooke (1738), by Brooke, and by Layng, and of the whole by J. Hoole (1762). French translations may be noted as follows: Mirabaud (1724); Le Brun, the best (1774); Baour, next to the best (1796); Desserteaux, not very literal, but popular (1855); Duchemvin (1856); Albert (1868). The standard German translation is that of J. D. Gries (1800). Duttenhofer's version (1840) is also well done. See other versions by Heinse (1785), Schindel (1800), and Malm (1835).

References. On the attempts to write epics in the classical vein see Flamini, Compendio di storia lett. ital., pp. 144–146, and appended bibliog., p. 356 (1914); also the larger histories. On Trissino: Spingarn's Lit. Crit. in Ren., p. 112 (1899), Ciampolini's Un poema eroico nella prima metà del cinquecento (Lucca: 1881), Ermini's L'Italia Liberata di G. G. Trissino (Roma: 1895), and F. Capalbo's Le fonti cavalleresche dell' Italia Liberata, etc. (Cosenza: 1906).

The following works deal with Tasso and the Gerusalemme Liberata: A. Belloni, Gli epigoni della Gerusalemme (Padova: 1893); W. Boulting, Tasso and his Times (Lond.: 1907); V. Cherbuliez, T. Tasso (in *Rev. d. Deux Mondes*, CXXI, 418); V. Crescini, T. Tasso (Padova: 1895); G. J. Ferrazzi, Torquato Tasso, Studi biografici-critici-bibliografici (Bassano: 1880); F. Flamini, Il Cinquecento, p. 497 ff., with bibliography on pp. 580–582; R. Garnett, Hist. of Italian Lit. (see Appendix), Chap. XVIII, — *multum in parvo*; Hallam, Introd. to the Lit. of Europe; E. J. Hasell, Tasso (1882); G. Mazzoni, Della G. L., etc. (in his Tra libri e carte. Roma: 1887); E. de Maldè, Le fonti della G. L. (Parma: 1910); Manzoni, Preface to the Sansoni ed.; R. Milman, Life of Tasso (1850); G. Muoni, Il Tasso e i romantici (Milano: 1904); S. Multineddu, Le fonti della G. L. (Torino: 1895); E. Nencioni, T. Tasso (in La vita ital. nel cinquecento, Milano: 1894); C. M. Phillimore, Studies in Italian Literature (Lond.: 1891); Sismondi, Lit.

of the South of Europe (2d ed. 1846); A. Solerti, Vita di T. Tasso (3 vols. Torino: 1895), the chief work on the life of the poet; J. A. Symonds, Renaissance in Italy (vol. II, Chaps. 7, 8. 1886); V. Vivaldi, La più grande polemica del cinquecento, etc. (Cantanzaro: 1895; cf. Solerti in the *Giorn. storico*, 27: 426–431); by the same, Sulle fonti della G. L. (2 vols. Cantanzaro: 1893; cf. Solerti in the *Giorn. storico*, 24: 255–266); by the same, La G. L. studiata nelle sue fonti (2 vols. Trani: 1901); by the same, Prolegomeni ad uno studio completo sulle fonti della G. L. (Trani: 1904); G. E. Woodberry, The Inspiration of Poetry (N.Y.: 1910), which contains a popular essay on Tasso.

On the institution of chivalry, see G. G. Coulton, Art. Knighthood and Chivalry (in the Encyc. Brit., 11th ed.); S. W. Cornish, Chivalry (2d ed. Lond.: 1908), a small work, but a good one; L. Gautier, La chevalerie en France (Paris: 1883), "with an apologetic bias, but full and correct in its references"; C. Mills, History of Chivalry (Philadelphia: 1884); S. Luce, Hist. de Du Guesclin et de son époque (2d ed. Paris: 1882), admirable, but incomplete; J. F. Rowbotham, The Troubadours and Courts of Love (Lond.: 1895), with bibliography, pp. 315–317; W. H. Schofield, Chivalry in English Lit. (Cambridge: 1912); A. Schultz, Höfisches Leben z. Zeit der Minnesinger (Leipz.: 1879); Sir Walter Scott, Essay on Chivalry; Ste.-Palaye, Mémoires sur l'ancienne chevalerie, etc. (in Mémoires . . . de l'Académie royale des inscriptions. Vol. XX. 1753. The edition of 1781 is more convenient for use); by the same, Histoire litt. des Troubadours (ed. Millot, 3 vols., Paris: 1774; tr. S. Dobson, Lond.: 1779); Sir E. Strachey, Essay on Chivalry (in his ed. of Morte Darthur, Lond.: 1886). The histories by Freeman and Green may also be consulted; and Schofield's Eng. Lit. from the Norman Conquest to Chaucer.

F. *Later Epic and Mock-Heroic Poems.*

Among the imitations of the Gerusalemme Liberata in the seventeenth century may be mentioned, though all of little note, Bracciolini's Croce Racquistata, Chiabrera's Erminia (and three other heroic poems), Camillo Camilli's Cinque Canti, Grandi's Tancredi, Verdizzotti's Boemondo, Graziani's Conquista di Granata and Malmignati's Enrico. The Adone of Marini (1623) is a discursive epic of different style — mythological, descriptive, and quasi-scientific. Early in the century the counter-movement in mock-heroic verse was started by Tassoni, whose Secchia Rapita not only parodies the fashionable epic but indulges in personal and social satire. Written before 1618, though not published till 1622, it originated a new poetic genre. Of somewhat similar mock-heroic quality were Bracciolini's mythological parody the Scherno degli Dèi, and a numerous following of the Secchia Rapita — most notable, perhaps, the Asino of Dottori and the Malmantile Racquistato of Lorenzo Lippi. — In the poetry of the eighteenth century the burlesque of Pulci, Boiardo, Ariosto, and Berni was further prosecuted in the jovially satiric Ricciardetto (1700–1738) of Niccolò Forteguerri. Genuine epical qualities may here and there be detected, as in the biblical and Dantesque Visioni of Varano and other poems. For other epical poetry of the period see G. Mazzoni's L' Ottocento, Chap. VI (A. M. Ricci, P. Bagnole, L. Costa, D. Roero Saluzzo). But the student will not make deliberate pause until he reaches Monti's Bassvilliana of 1793 (which owes much to Varano, more to Klopstock and Dante), and his Mascheroniana of 1801. For the 19th century see Collison-Morley, p. 323. — For further examples of the Italian epic see the general histories, and L. Frigeri, Principii della nuova epopea italiana (Mantova: 1879), and the bibliography in Flamini's Compendio di storia della letteratura italiana (Livorno: 1914).

VII. **Spanish Epics.**

For general apparatus see above, § 6, IX, and the histories of Spanish literature listed in the Appendix. For the bibliography of the Spanish epic in general see the recent Spanish (Madrid: 1916) and French editions of Fitzmaurice-Kelly's History of Spanish Literature. The best monograph on the Spanish epic is R. M. Pidal's L'épopée castillane à travers la littérature espagnole (Paris: 1910), noted above, § 11.

A. *Poema del Cid.*

See Pidal and Fitzmaurice-Kelly, as noted above; Milá y Fontanals, Chaytor, Gröber, F. J. Wolf, and others, as noted above, § 6, IX, A; J. Clark, as noted above, § 11; also Morf (in the *Deutsche Rundschau*, June 1900, p. 377), and F. Hanssen, Sobre la poesía épica de los Visigodos (Santiago, Chile: 1892).

The discovery of Spanish heroic poetry (*cantares de gesta*) was late (1874). In 1865 Gaston Paris believed that there was no Spanish epic (Hist. poétique de Charlemagne, 1865, p. 203); in 1898, in the *Journal des savants* for May and June, Paris acknowledged his mistake. It was the Spanish savant Milá y Fontanals who 'discovered' the early epical poetry of Spain. In his work De la poesía heroico-popular castellana (Barcelona: 1874), this critic, after an extended review of previous works bearing upon the subject, shows that in Castile there was a great epic activity that reached its culmination during the 11th and 12th centuries, with a period of splendid decadence during the 13th and 14th centuries, and that the romances were fragments of the long poems of this decadence. Two theories of the origin of Spanish epical poetry have been proposed. According to the first a probable origin is found in the French *chanson de geste* (see Paris, as just noted; E. de Hinojosa, Discursos en la Academia Española, March 1904; A. Bello, vol. IV, p. 279, of the Obras completas, Santiago, Chile: 1883). The second theory sets up a Germanic origin (see the work of R. M. Pidal, cited above, § 11).

Of the whole body of epical poetry, presumably great if we may judge from the frequency with which the old chronicles allude to the stories of the *juglares*, little has survived. Ramón Menéndez Pidal has pieced together from the Crónica general (13th century) part of a poem upon the Infantes de Lara (1896). The Poema de Fernán González (ed., with critical text, introd., notes, and glossary, by C. C. Marden, Baltimore: 1904), dealing with deeds of the 10th century, was not composed until 1250 or later. But the chief remains of the early activity in heroic verse are the two fragmentary poems on the Cid (Rodrigo Diaz de Bivar, d. 1099), — the Poema del Cid, from about the middle of the 12th century, and the Crónica rimada del Cid, from the 14th century at the earliest though including materials of greater antiquity. The former is "but a fragment of 3744 lines, written in a barbarous style, in rugged assonant rhymes, and a rude

Alexandrine measure, but it glows with the pure fire of poetry, and is full of a noble simplicity and a true epical grandeur, invaluable as a living picture of the age" (Art. Cid, Encyc. Brit.).

> In the Poema the treatment is obviously modelled upon the Chanson de Roland. . . . The machinery in both cases is very similar. . . . But allowing for the fact that the Spanish *juglar* borrows his framework, his performance is great by virtue of its simplicity, its strength, its spirit and fire. . . . There is an unity of conception and of language which forbids our accepting the Poema as the work of several hands; and the division of the poem into separate *cantares* is managed with a discretion which argues a single artistic intelligence. . . . Indubitably this [a passage on the charge of the Cid at Alcocer] is the work of an original genius who redeemed his superficial borrowings of incident from Roland by a treatment all his own (Fitzmaurice-Kelly, Hist. Span. Lit., N.Y.: 1904, pp. 49–51).

Another theory, now rather discredited, regards the Poema as an 'amalgam' of primitive *cantilenas*, or short lyrical poems. No such *cantilenas* are now in existence.

In addition to the problems of origin the student will find here the double opportunity of tracing the later forms of the Cid story in the romances of the 14th and 15th centuries, and in the ballads of the Cid, about 200 in number, most of them probably from the 16th century. The relation of the idealized Cid of the Poema and romances to the historical Cid has been studied at some length and involves a valuable instance of epical idealization. For more specific problems see Pidal, as already noted, and the works listed below, under References.

Texts and Translations. The original edition of the Poema was by T. A. Sánchez (1779); the best editions are those of K. Vollmöller (Halle: 1879); Menéndez Pidal, Cantar de mio Cid, texto, gramática y vocabulario (3 vols. Madrid: 1908–11. Cf. the same author's Poema del Cid. Madrid: 1913); A. M. Huntington, The Poem of the Cid (3 vols. N.Y.: 1897–1902), an *édition de luxe*, in which an attempt is made to establish a definitive text (vol. I Text; II Translation; III Notes). The standard English *translations* are those of J. H. Frere (1808) and J. Ormsby (Lond.: 1879), and that of Huntington just mentioned. A new translation in verse and prose by R. S. Rose and Leonard Bacon, The Lay of the Cid, scholarly and of decided stylistic value, has recently been issued by the University of California Press (Semicentennial Publications, Berkeley: 1919). There are a literal French translation by Hinard and German versions by Herder and by J. Adam (in *Roman. Forsch.*, 32: 185. 1912). — For the Cid ballads see Durán's collection in two volumes in the Romancero general (Rivadeneyra's Biblioteca de autores españoles); for the Cid romances see Escobar's Romancero del Cid (Madrid: 1818). Also see Ballads of the Cid, translated by L. Gerard (1883); Ancient Spanish Ballads, trans. by J. G. Lockhart (1823).

References. In addition to the authorities already cited the following are important: G. Baist, Spanische Litteratur (in Gröber's Grundriss); V. Balaguer, Hist. polít. y literaria de los trovadores (2 vols. Madrid: 1878–79); E. Baret, Du poème du Cid dans ses analogies avec la Chanson de Roland (Paris: 1863); B. Clarke, The Cid Campeador and the Waning of the Crescent in the West ("Heroes of the Nations." 1902); R. Dozy, Recherches sur l'histoire et la littérature de l'Espagne pendant le moyen âge (3d ed. 2 vols. Leyden: 1887), — for the historical and poetical Cid; Milá y Fontanals, De los trovadores en España (Barcelona: 1882); L. de Monge, Études morales et littéraires (Paris: 1887); M. Menéndez y Pelayo, Tratado de los romances viejos (in the author's Antología de poetas líricos castellanos. Vol. XI, 1903; XII, 1906); P. J. Pidal, Estudios literarios (in Colección de escritores castellanos críticos. 2 vols. Madrid: 1890. See vol. I, p. 61 ff.); R. M. Pidal, La leyenda de los infantes de Lara (Madrid: 1896); by the same, El poema del Cid y las crónicas generales de España (Paris: 1908. In *Rev. hispanique*, 5: 435); Comte de Puymaigre, Les vieux auteurs castillans (2d ed. 2 vols. Paris: 1888–90); G. Saintsbury, The Flourishing of Romance (N.Y.: 1897. Chap. IX); M. G. Sigura, La poesía épica en España (in *Revista de España*, 115: 572); C. M. de Vasconcellos, Estudos sobre o Romanceiro peninsular (in *Cultura española*, Aug. 1907–Aug. 1909, vols. VII–XV); H. E. Watts, The Cid (Encyc. Brit., 11th ed.), — on the historical character of the Cid. On the structure of Spanish epic verse a very convenient outline, with references to authorities, will be found in the *Trans. and Proc. Amer. Phil. Assoc.* (A. M. Espinosa, The Metrical Structure of Early Spanish Epic Verse. Vol. XLI, 1910). For the sake of its suggestion of problems the outline may be quoted at length: "A defense of the theory of Milá y Fontanals and Menéndez Pidal, *i.e.*, that the old Spanish epic verse was not metrical. The presentation and defense of their theories with additional evidence. — I. The earliest Spanish epic poetry represents the transition from an earlier irregular form to a fixed metrical verse, which in the Spanish ballads finally developed into a 16-syllable verse. — Theories of the versification of the Cid. Diez, Wolf, Restori, Hinard, and the French epic meters. The theories of French imitation lost ground when Milá y Fontanals proved the existence of an indigenous Spanish epic poetry. The versification theories of Milá. Metrical irregularity his conclusion. Cornu and the theory of the original ballad meter. Pidal and Hanssen accept this, but M. Pidal now defends Milá. The theory of Milá as now accepted by M. Pidal, the only sound theory. Additional evidences. A fixed metrical verse is out of the question in the earliest periods of any Romance poetry. Characteristics of early Romance poetry. Non-metrical assonanced verses. The old epic verse and its irregularity. The evidences of the learned poets. — II. The Versification of the oldest Spanish Ballads. — The 16-syllable verse predominates, but evidences of the earlier irregularities still appear. The meter of the Cid, Rodrigo, and Infantes de Lara compared with that of the ballads. The development of a fixed regular meter in Spanish epic poetry is a fact which no one can deny. In Cid twenty-five per cent of verses have octosyllabic hemistichs, in the Infantes de Lara fifty per cent, in the old ballads seventy-five per cent, and finally the sixteenth century ballads assume a definite form, a 16-syllable verse."

B. *Other Epical Poetry*. The student should consider the epic qualities of such poems as the Chanson du siège de Zamora; the Poema del Alfonso XI, the work of Rodrigo Yañez, discovered in 1573; the Enfances de Rodrigue; and the epic materials in the Romancero. On these and other poems, see Pidal as cited above, § 11. Montalvo's Amadis de Gaula is the first and best of the Castilian romances of chivalry: the student may consult Baist (in Gröber's Grundriss, II, 2, 441); E. Baret, De l'Amadis de Gaule et de son influence sur les mœurs et la littérature au XVI^e et au XVII^e siècle, avec une notice bibliographique (2d ed. Paris: 1873); L. de Monge, as cited above, § 8. See also under References, above.

The Ancient Poetry and Romances are to some extent made accessible to English readers by Dr. Bowring's work of that title (Lond.: 1824). His authorities were principally the Correo literario de Sevilla (1806); the Cancionero general de muchos y diversos autores (Valencia: 1511, and Antwerp: 1573); the Cancionero de Amberes (1559); the

Colección de poesías castellanas anteriores al siglo XV, by Tomás Ant. Sánchez (4 vols. Madrid: 1779); Böhl de Faber's Floresta de rimas antiguas castellanas (3 vols. Hamburg: 1821–25); the Primavera y flor de romances de varios poetas (Madrid: 1623); Primavera de varios romances (Valencia: 1644); the Romancero general of Pedro de Flores (Madrid: 1614); the Silva de romances (1644); and the collected works of individual poets. To this list of sources may be added Depping's Sammlung der besten alten spanischen historischen Ritter- und maurischen Romanzen (Altenberg u. Leipz.: 1817); Grimm's Silva de romances viejos (Vienna: 1815); Durán's Romancero de romances moriscos (Madrid: 1828), and his Romances caballerescos (Madrid: 1829); and Ochoa's Tesoro de los romanceros y cancioneros españoles (Paris: 1838). Further bibliography in Körting and Gröber.

La Araucana of Alonso de Ercilla y Zúñiga (1533–95) is based on the wars between the Araucanian Indians of Chile and the Spanish invaders. "It consists of three parts, of which the first, composed in Chile and published in 1569, is a versified narrative adhering strictly to historic fact; the second, published in 1578, is encumbered with visions and other romantic machinery; and the third, which appeared in 1589–90, contains, in addition to the subject proper, a variety of episodes mostly irrelevant. This so-called epic lacks symmetry, and has been over-praised by Cervantes and Voltaire; but it is written in excellent Spanish and is full of vivid rhetorical passages. An analysis of the poem was given by Hayley in his Essay on Epic Poetry (1782)." Cf. Fitzmaurice-Kelly, Hist. de la lit. española (1916), pp. 184–185.

VIII. **Portuguese Epics.**

A. *Os Lusiadas.*

For bibliography of works dealing with Camoens and his Os Lusiadas see Körting's Encykl. (1886), 3: 595–596; the Bibliographia Camoniana, servindo de catalogo official da exposição litt. das festas (Porto: 1880); T. Braga, Bibliographia Camoniana (Lisb.: 1880); Brito-Aranha, vols. XIV and XV of the Diccionario bibl. portuguez (Lisb.: 1887–88). For the *editions* see Körting, 3: 595. The *editio princeps* is of date 1572. Other editions by Juromenha (Lisb.: 1869. Also in vol. V of Brockhaus' Collecção de autores portuguezes. Leipz.: 1866+); C. von

Reinhardstöttner (Strassburg: 1874–75); Braga (Porto: 1880); Coelho (Lisb.: 1880). — *Translations* into English by Sir Richard Fanshawe (1655), W. J. Mickle (2 vols. Lond.: 1798), T. M. Musgrave (1826), E. Quillinan (1853), R. Burton (Lond.: 1880), R. F. Duff (1880), and J. J. Aubertin (2d ed. Lond.: 1884); into French by Duperron de Castera (Paris: 1768), Fournier et Desaules (Paris: 1841); into Italian by A. Nervi (1882); into German by C. C. Heise (Hamburg: 1806?), J. J. C. Donner (Stuttgart: 1833), Booch-Arkossy (Leipz.: 1854), C. Eitner (Hildburghausen: 1869), W. Storck (the entire works in 6 vols. Paderborn: 1880–85. The epic is in vol. V). Of the German versions, those of Storck and Donner are the best.

The following works and articles may be consulted: J. Adamson, Memoirs of the Life and Writings of L. de Camoens (2 vols. Lond.: 1820); A. F. G. Bell, Studies in Portuguese Literature (Oxford: 1914); T. Braga, Historia de C. (3 vols. Porto: 1873–75; being vols. XII and XIII of the author's Historia da litteratura portugueza); R. Burton, Camoens, his Life and his Lusiads (Lond.: 1881); J. Clark, as noted above, § 11; Juromenha, Introductions, etc., of his edition of the works, mentioned above; C. Lamare, C. et les Lusiades (Paris: 1878); M. Lemos, L. de C. (Paris: 1881); E. Leoni, Camões e os Lusiadas (Lisb.: 1872); F. A. Lobo, Memoria hist. e critica acerca de L. de C. e das suas obras (in *Hist. e mem. da Acad. Real das Sc. de Lisboa*, N. S., vol. VII, 1821); O. Martins, Os Lusiadas, ensaio sobre C. e a sua obra em relação á sociedade portugueza e ao movimento da renascença (Porto: 1872; 1891); C. May (in *Herrig's Archiv*, 49: 121); R. de Novery, Les voyages de C. (Paris: 1880); C. von Reinhardstöttner, L. de C., der Sänger der Lusiaden (2d ed. Leipz.: 1877); F. von Schlegel (see above, § 8); Sismondi (see above, § 11; see vol. II, Chaps. XXXVII, XXXVIII, of the work); Mme. de Staël, Camoëns (in the Biographie universelle, being vol. XVII of her Œuvres. Paris: 1820–21); C. M. de Vasconcellos and T. Braga (in Gröber's Grundriss); Vasconcellos, Arts. in the *Ztschr. für roman. Phil.* (7: 407, 494; 8: 1); G. E. Woodberry, The Inspiration of Poetry (N.Y.: 1910. Chap. III). See also the histories of Portuguese literature.

B. For *other Portuguese epic material*, see the histories, and F. Wolf, Studien zur Geschichte der spanischen und portugiesischen Nationalliteratur (Berlin: 1859. On the epic of the Middle Ages). For metrical romances see T. Braga, Cancioneiro e romanceiro geral portuguez, and Romanceiro geral portuguez (2d ed. 2 vols. Lisb.: 1906–07), where further bibliography may be had.

A Brazilian epic, in Portuguese, is that of Gonzalve de Magalhães, entitled A Confederação dos Tamoyos (see Körting, Encykl., 1886, 3: 589).

IX. English Epics.

For general apparatus see above, § 6, XI. Aside from the histories of the literature, Dixon's English Epic and Heroic Poetry (noted above, § 11) is the chief guide. J. Clark's Hist. of Epic Poetry (also noted above, § 11) is of little help. The bibliographies in the Camb. Hist. of Eng. Lit. should be consulted for each poem or group of poems.

A. *Finnsburg and Waldere Fragments.* On these epical narratives, which resemble the German Hildebrandslied and which are fragments of an ancient, pagan heroic poetry of the continent flourishing from the great Teutonic migration-wars of the fifth century through several subsequent centuries, see Alois Brandl in Paul's Grundriss, II, 1, pp. 949, 980 (2d ed.), Wülker's Grundriss, §§ 296–299 (1885), and F. Dieter, Die Walderefragmente und die ursprüngliche Gestalt der Walthersage (in *Anglia*, 10: 227. 1888; 11: 159. 1889), in each of which further bibliography is given. For the Latin Waltharius see above, IV, F, and Paul 81–86.

B. *The Beowulf.*

For bibliography consult, first of all, Brandl's Versuch einer Beowulf-Bibliographie (in Paul's Grundriss der germ. Philol., 2d ed., 2: 1, 1015–1024), of which the following notes are, in the main, a condensation, and the bibliographical notes of Sedgefield's ed., listed below. R. Wülker's Grundriss zur Geschichte der angelsächsischen Litteratur (Leipz.: 1885) is an indispensable guide to the study of Anglo-Saxon literature; the treatment of the Beowulf begins on p. 244, and the chief questions of Beowulf study are noted in detail, along with copious summaries of the works belonging to the discussion. J. R. Clark, Beowulf, etc. (1901), and H. M. Ayres, Bibliographical Sketch of Anglo-Saxon Lit. (Columbia Univ. N. Y.: 1910), supply some of the more important of recent titles; many reviews and notices will be found in the *Jahresbericht über d. Erscheinungen auf dem Geb. d. germ. Philol.* (Leipz.: 1879 +), and in the *Anzeigen zur Anglia* (Halle: 1881 +) and the *Anglia Beiblatt* (1890 +).

The chief problems in the study of Beowulf, so far as the literary type is concerned, may be indicated by the following: In what way did the poem originate, — as an original composition by a single author who made use of traditional material, or as a collection of separate lays? This is the Homeric question over again; or, to be more exact, it is the question that arises by applying the *Lieder-Theorie* to the Anglo-Saxon epic. The first to make the application was Müllenhoff. For a summary of the discussion (involving works by Rönning, Ettmüller, Köhler, Grein, Simrock, Möller, Hornburg, etc.) see Wülker, p. 288 ff. In the Beowulf, far more than in the Homeric epics, there is evidence of a stitching together of lays. But is not this stitching of the Beowulf comparable to earlier forms of the Homeric tales, to earlier minstrel-cycles, rather than to the Greek epics in their finished form? Does not the inferiority of the style and narrative art of Beowulf as compared with the Iliad and Odyssey render such a supposition very probable? The student will be particularly interested in the evidences of Christian redaction of the pagan lays. Here, readily accessible, is an example of some of those intervening and transitional stages by which the scale of an original epical lay is revised and enlarged to agree with the consciousness of a later civilization. That this enlargement and sophistication of the earlier heroic lays fell to the missionary zeal of priestly editors, as appears probable from the nature of the changes, was no doubt unfortunate for the vitality and growth of the English epic. In this connection there comes strongly to the front the question of the relative fitness of the pagan and Christian religions for treatment in epic form, — a question that occasioned much debate among the Renaissance theorists, as we have already seen (see above, §§ 7, 8, 9). Closely connected with this problem is that of the comparative investigation of the mythological materials of the Beowulf, — the original significance of the monsters, of Beowulf himself, and of his exploits, etc. An allied problem would be the attempt to trace the stories of the Beowulf in continental literatures — a study of importance in establishing the nature of the distribution of the pagan and pagan-Christian lays. Concerning the style of the poem as related to the style of the Germanic heroic lay in general some very interesting investigations have already been made. The relation of the Beowulf to ballad forms is part of the general problem of composition, or epic growth.

Editions and Translations. For editions up to 1884, see Wülker, pp. 245–246; add the Heyne-Socin ed. (1888–1903); Harrison and Sharp (Boston: 1894); Zupitza, Autotypes, etc. (EETS., vol. LXXVII, 1882); Wyatt (1898); Trautmann (1904); Holthausen (1905–06); W. J. Sedgefield (2d ed. Manchester: 1913), which is very useful and incorporates the chief results of recent investigations. — *Translations:* for translations up to 1882, see Wülker, pp. 247–249; to Wülker's list may be added the English versions of Earle (1892), Morris and Wyatt (prose, 1895; 2d ed., 1898), J. R. C. Hall (prose, 1901), C. B. Tinker (prose, 1902; revised, 1910), C. G. Child (prose, 1904), and Gummere (The Oldest English Epic. N.Y.: 1909); see C. B. Tinker, The Translations of Beowulf, A Critical Bibliography (*Yale Studies in English*, No. 16. 1903). Of recent German translations, there should be noted Hoffmann's, in verse (1893), Trautmann's, in prose (1904), and Gering's alliterative version (1906). Add also Grion's version, in Italian prose (1883). For critical articles on the various translations, see Wülker (in *Anglia*, vol. IV, 1881, Anz. 69 ff.; Gummere (in *Am. Journ. Philol.*, 7: 46 ff.); Frye (in *MLN.*, 12: 153 ff.); Tinker (in *Yale Studies*, No. 16. 1903).

References. The following critical works have been selected, in the main, from Brandl and Wülker: C. S. Baldwin, Introd. to English Medieval Lit. (N.Y.: 1914); A. Banning, Die epischen Formeln im Beowulf I (Marburg: 1886); A. Biese, Die Entwickelung des Naturgefühls im Mittelalter und in der Neuzeit (Leipz.: 1887); R. C. Boer, Beowulf (in *German. Handbibl.*, No. 11. Halle: 1912); A. Brandl (in Paul's Grundriss, as already indicated); B. ten Brink, Beowulf, Untersuchungen (Strassburg: 1888); by the same, Geschichte der englischen Litteratur (2d ed. 1899. See vol. II, p. 27 ff. For English translation, see Appendix); S. Brooke, Hist. of Early English Lit. (Lond.: 1892), revised as Eng. Lit. from the Beginning to the Norman Conquest (Lond.: 1898); J. J. Conybeare, Illustrations of Anglo-Saxon Poetry (Lond.: 1826); H. Dederich, Historische und geographische Studien zum a-s. Beowulf-liede (Köln: 1877); J. Earle, Anglo-Saxon

Lit. (Lond.: 1824. P. 120 ff.); H. Gering, Der Beowulf und die isländische Grettissaga (in *Anglia*, 3: 74. 1880); J. Gibb, Gudrun, Beowulf et Roland (in *Rev. crit.*, 1883); C. W. M. Grein, Die historischen Verhältnisse des Beowulfliedes (in *Jahrb. für roman. und engl. Lit.*, 4: 260); F. Gummere, The Anglo-Saxon Metaphor (Halle: 1881), with which cf. R. Heinzel's Über den Stil der altgermanischen Poesie (in *Quellen und Forsch.*, Bd. X. 1875), and A. Hoffmann's Der bildliche Ausdruck im Beowulf und in der Edda (in *Engl. Studien*, 6: 163–216. 1883); D. H. Haigh, The Anglo-Saxon Sagas, An Examination of their Value as Aids to History, etc. (Lond.: 1861); E. D. Hanscom, The Feeling for Nature in O. E. Poetry (in *Jr. Eng. and Germ. Phil.*, 5: 439. 1903–05); B. Häuschkel, Die Technik der Erzählung im Beowulfliede (Breslau: 1904); Heusler (see above, § 11); Hornburg, Die Composition des Beowulfs (Metz: 1877; Progr.); W. P. Ker, Epic and Romance (2d ed. Lond.: 1908); F. Klaeber, Die christlichen Elemente im Beowulf (in *Anglia*, 35: 111, 249, 453. 1912; 36: 169. 1912); A. Köhler, Germanische Alterthümer im Beowulf (in *Germania*, 13: 129–158); by the same, Die Einleitung des Beowulfsliedes, Ein Beitrag über die Liedertheorie (in *Zacher's Zeitschr.*, 2: 305–321); L. Laistner, Das Rätsel der Sphinx, Grundzüge einer Mythengeschichte (Berlin: 1889. See vol. II, p. 21 ff.); H. Leo, Beowulf, Heldengedicht des 8. Jahrh. (Zürich: 1840); O. Lüning, Die Natur in der altgerm. und mhd. Epik (Zürich: 1889); F. March, The World of Beowulf (in *Trans. Am. Phil. Ass.*, 1882); H. Merbach, Das Meer in den Dichtungen der Anglss. (Breslau: 1884); R. M. Meyer, Die altgerm. Poesie nach ihren formelhaften Elementen beschrieben (Berlin: 1889); H. Möller, Das altenglische Volksepos, etc. (Kiel: 1883); H. Morley, English Writers (vol. I, Chap. VI. Lond.: 1898); K. Müllenhoff, Die innere Geschichte des Beowulfs (in *Haupt's Zeitschr.*, 14: 242–244; cf., in the same journal, an article by the same author, 12: 282–288); N. Müller, Die Mythen im Beowulf (Leipz.: 1878); E. Otto, Typische Motive in dem weltlichen Epos der Anglss. (Berlin: 1902); T. Rönning, Beowulfs-Kvadet (Copenh.: 1883); J. E. Routh, Two Studies on the Ballad Theory of the Beowulf (Baltimore: 1905); G. Sarrazin, Die Abfassungszeit des Beowulfliedes (in *Anglia*, 14: 399. 1892), and Die Beowulf Sage in Dänemark (*ibid.* 9: 195. 1886); F. Schneider, Der Kampf mit Grendels Mutter, etc. (Berlin: 1887); Sedgefield, Introd. to his ed., noted above; A. H. Tolman, The Style of Anglo-Saxon Poetry (in *Pubs. Mod. Lang. Ass.*, *Trans.*, vol. III, 1887); M. Trautmann, Finn und Hildebrand (Bonn: 1903). See, further, the periodicals pertaining to the field, as listed in the Appendix.

C. *Early Christian Epical Literature.*

On Caedmon and Cynewulf, on the Exodus, Genesis, Daniel, on the Guthlac, Andreas, Elene, Judith, etc., see Paul's Grundriss (2d ed., 2: 1, 1025–1051, 1091–1092), and the proper sections in Wülker. See also G. Sarrazin, Von Kädmon bis Kynewulf (Berlin: 1914),—most helpful; W. W. Lawrence, Medieval Story (N. Y.: 1911); G. H. Gerould, Saints' Legends (see above, § 11); G. A. Smithson, The Old English Christian Epic, etc. (in *Univ. Calif. Pubs. Mod. Philol.*, vol. I. Berkeley: 1910); and references given above, under B. Among the many monographs on Cynewulf the following may be noted: Glöde, in *Anglia*, 9: 27. 1886, and 11: 146. 1889; Blackburn, *ibid.* 19: 89. 1897; Trautmann, in *Bonner Beiträge zur Anglistik*, No. 1. 1898; S. Moore, in *Jr. Eng. and Germ. Phil.*, 14: 556. 1915; McGillivray, in *Stud. z. eng. Phil.*, No. 8. 1902; but see K. Jansen, Die Cynewulf-Forschung von ihren Anfängen bis zur Gegenwart (in *Bonner Beiträge*, No. 24. 1908), extended in *Anglia Beiblatt*, 22: 337, *et passim. Translations:* C. W. Kennedy, Cynewulf's Poems (prose, with introd. and bibliog. Lond.: 1910); I. Gollancz, Christ (Lond.: 1892); C. H. Whitman, Christ (Boston: 1900); J. Menzies, Elene (Edinb.: 1895); L. H. Holt, Elene (prose, in *Yale Studies in Eng.*, No. 21. 1904); R. K. Root, Andreas (verse, in *Yale Studies in Eng.*, No. 7. 1899); J. M. Garnett, Judith, Elene, Brunanburh, and Maldon (Boston: 1889); J. L. Hall, Judith, Phoenix, Andreas, Brunanburh, and Maldon (N. Y.: 1902); Cook and Tinker, Select Translations from Old English Poetry (Boston: 1902). A. S. Cook's critical edition of the Christ deserves special mention. Further bibliography in Paul, Wülker, Camb. Hist. Eng. Lit., and Ayres, as already noted.

This epical poetry is of course largely paraphrastic, but the sum total of originality is surprising. The field offers peculiarly acceptable material for the study of the interrelation of the Christian religion and the development of the epic. Back of these Christian epics is a pagan and practically polytheistic love of myth. One can see this at every turn of the stories of saints and warriors, of miracles and monsters. What then makes the difference in vitality of type as between this literature and the epic of the Greeks? What differences in the position and character of the tellers of the stories? of the audiences? Consider the relations of the two cultures brought together in these epics,—

Roman-Christian and Teutonic, — and, back of the Christian, the unrealized influence of the culture of the ancient Hebrews. In what way does this combination, or confusion, of cultures resemble the conditions of civilization antecedent to other epic literatures? Is a new set of cultural-literary variations visible here?

D. *English Arthurian Romances.*

To attempt an outline of the vast literature dealing with the Arthurian and other romances would carry us too far beyond the scope of this section. The best general introduction is afforded by W. H. Schofield's scholarly work, English Literature from the Norman Conquest to Chaucer (N.Y.: 1906), which has a bibliographical appendix. Another introductory survey, of a different scope, is contained in C. S. Baldwin's Introd. to Eng. Medieval Lit. (N.Y.: 1914); see also Renan's La poésie des races celtiques (in *Rev. d. Deux Mondes*, 1854); Saintsbury's Flourishing of Romance and the Rise of Allegory (Edinb.: 1897); Gregory Smith's The Transition Period (1900); G. Paris' Litt. fr. au moyen âge; W. P. Ker's Epic and Romance (2d ed. Lond.: 1908), Chap. V of which deals with the French romances; the same author's Essays on Medieval Lit. (1905); and W. W. Lawrence's Medieval Story (N.Y.: 1911). Among the histories of English literature special attention should be directed to the Camb. Hist. Eng. Lit., Morley's English Writers (vol. III), and Jusserand's Lit. Hist. of the English People. A. H. Billings' Guide to the Middle English Metrical Romances (in *Yale Studies in English*, IX. N.Y.: 1901) is a practical and suggestive survey of the domain and should always be at hand. H. L. D. Ward's Catalogue of the Romances in the Manuscripts Dept. of the British Museum (Lond.: 1883) provides the advanced student with the list of materials; convenient aid is often given by Lewis Spence's Dictionary of Medieval Romance and Romance Writers. See also, for comparative studies, Betz-Baldensperger, La litt. comparée, essai bibliographique, pp. 90–95 (2d ed. Strasbourg: 1904).

The confused and largely problematic growth of the Arthurian stories, from their origin in early lays about a British hero of the sixth century (glorified by identification, say Rhys and others, with the Brythonic deity and culture-hero Artor), through their expansion in later periods in correspondence with the larger scope and interests of a later European culture, and their final aggregation in written cycles some six hundred years after the origin of the first Arthur-lays, is a story of narrative development that bears striking resemblances to the growth of the great national epics of other peoples. Criticism is concerned with tracing these resemblances in detail, noting their causes as far as possible, explaining the absence of a final epic florescence of the lays, establishing the relation of the romances to the ballad as well as to a possible epic, tabulating the distribution of the romances, the borrowings and variations in texts, etc. Is the technique of the romances the technique of pre-epical lays, or is it the technique of an age long past the productivity of national epic?

The indebtedness, on the one hand, of English and some American poets to the Arthurian cycle, their divergence, on the other, from Geoffrey of Monmouth, Wace, Layamon, the rhyming romances of Sir Gawayne and the Grene Knight, Sir Tristrem, Morte Arthure, and Le Morte Arthur, and from Malory, suggest an interesting study in the modernization of ancient themes and its poetic justification. Some examples, beside the best-known in Tennyson's Idylls of the King and his preceding and succeeding poems upon the subject, are Matthew Arnold's Tristram and Iseult (1852), Laurence Binyon's Tristram and Isoult, Sir Richard Blackmore's Prince Arthur (1695) and King Arthur (1697), Carr's play of King Arthur, Drayton's reminiscences of the story in Polyolbion (1613, 1623), Dryden's drama of King Arthur (1691), Sebastian Evans' Arthur's Knighting and his Eve of Morte Arthur (1875), Fielding's burlesque in the Tragedy of Tragedies, or the Life and Death of Tom Thumb the Great (1730), R. S. Hawker's Quest of the Sangraal (1863), Reginald Heber's unfinished Morte Arthur and the Masque of Guendolen (1812–26), Richard Hovey's dramas, The Quest of Merlin, The Marriage of Guenevere, The Birth of Galahad, and Taliesin, Thomas Hughes' Misfortunes of Arthur (1588), John Leyden's praises of Arthur in Scenes of Infancy (1803), Lowell's Vision of Sir Launfal, Lord Lytton's King Arthur (1848), F. Millard's Tristram and Iseult (1870), Milton's references in Paradise Lost (I, 579) and Paradise

Regained (II, 354), William Morris' The Chapel in Lyoness (1856), The Defence of Guinevere (1858), Arthur's Tomb, and Sir Galahad, Percy's revival of the ballad versions in the Reliques of English Poetry (1765), Sir Walter Scott's elaboration of the metrical romance of Sir Tristrem (1805) and his Bridal of Triermain (1813), G. A. Simcox's Farewell of Ganore (1869), and his Gawain and the Lady of Avalon, Southey's references in Madoc (1805), Spenser's employment of materials in the Faerie Queene (1590–96), Swinburne's Tristram of Lyonesse (1882), John Veitch's Merlin and other Poems (1889), Thomas Warton's Grave of King Arthur (1777), Wordsworth's Artegal and Elidure and his Egyptian Maid (1830). Most of these are discussed in relation to their treatment of the original "material of Britain" by M. W. Maccallum in his Tennyson's Idylls of the King, etc., mentioned below.

Similar studies may be undertaken in the other 'matters' of romance, as the Germanic legends, the cycles of Charlemagne, and the romances of antiquity.

References. Works of a more special character, to which the English reader may turn for statement and discussion of the problems involved, are the lucid and very informing manual by W. Lewis Jones, King Arthur in History and Legend (Cambridge: 1911), and the following mentioned among others in the appended Bibliography (p. 139): Sir John Rhys, The Arthurian Legend (1891), and by the same, Celtic Heathendom, and Celtic Folklore (1901); W. H. Dickinson, King Arthur in Cornwall; R. H. Fletcher, The Arthurian Matter in the Chronicles (*Harv. Studies and Notes*, 1906); G. L. Kittredge (on the authorship of the Morte Darthur, in *Harvard Studies in Philol. and Lit.*, 4: 85–105); M. W. Maccallum, Tennyson's Idylls and Arthurian Story (N.Y.: 1894); W. W. Newell, King Arthur and the Table Round (Boston: 1897); Alfred Nutt, Celtic and Mediaeval Romance, and by the same, Legends of the Holy Grail (both in Pop. Studies in Mythol. and Folklore); by the same, Studies in the Legend of the Holy Grail (1888; for review by Zimmer, see *Göttingische gelehrte Anzeigen*, 1890); Jessie L. Weston, King Arthur and his Knights (in Pop. Studies in Mythol. and Folklore, Lond.: 1899); by the same, The Legend of Sir Gawain (in Nutt's Grimm's Library, 1897); Professor Zimmer's Nennius Vindicatus (1893).

— Of sources, given by W. L. Jones and others, as of most use and interest to the English reader, the following: J. A. Giles' trans. of Six Old Chronicles (Bohn); Sebastian Evans' trans. of Geoffrey of Monmouth's History of the Kings of Britain (Temple Classics); W. F. Skene's edition of The Four Ancient Books of Wales (Edinb.: 1868); Lady Charlotte Guest's trans. of the Mabinogion (Nutt's edition); R. A. S. MacAlister's edition of Two Arthurian Romances (from Ireland, Dublin: 1909); Sir F. Madden's edition of Layamon's Brut (3 vols., Lond.: 1847); Caxton's Malory's Morte Darthur, ed. by H. O. Sommer in 3 vols., — the most important edition (Lond.: 1889–91); or ed. by Sir J. Rhys (Dent); or ed. by Sir E. Strachey (Globe Series); or W. E. Mead's Morte Darthur (Boston: 1897). See V. D. Scudder, Le Morte Darthur of Sir Thomas Malory and its Sources (N. Y.: 1917); J. D. Bruce, The Development of the Mort Arthur Theme in Mediaeval Romance (in *Romanic Rev.*, 4: 4. 1913). The student may also consult the references given in this section in connection with the French *Épopée Courtoise* and the German Court Epic (see above, V, D; and below, XI, C, 2).

E. *Chaucer*, *Layamon*, *Barbour*, *etc.*

For these authors and their development of romance and romantic history, see W. M. Dixon, English Epic and Heroic Poetry, Chaps. VI, VII, and the appropriate sections in the chief histories of English literature; bibliography in Camb. Hist. Eng. Lit. Special mention may be made of G. L. Kittredge's Chaucer and his Poetry (Harvard Univ. Press).

F. *The Elizabethan Literary Epic.* A convenient introduction to these epics will be found in Chap. XII of F. E. Schelling's English Literature during the Lifetime of Shakespeare (N. Y.: 1910). The most important of the group is, of course, the Faerie Queene of Spenser, both intrinsically and historically; but detailed guidance cannot be given here. The student will not find it hard to collect the critical material upon the poem, especially if he begins with the convenient little book of F. I. Carpenter, An Outline Guide to the Study of Spenser (Chicago: 1894); H. E. Cory's novel and poetically constructive Edmund Spenser, a Critical Study (Univ. Calif. Press, Berkeley: 1917); G. L. Craik's Spenser and his Poetry (3 vols. 1845); R. W. Church's Spenser (in the English Men of Letters Series); Warton's Observations on the F. Q. (1754); and the Grosart edition of the works of Spenser (10 vols. 1882–84). The relation of Spenser's poem to the romantic epos established by Ariosto and Tasso (see above) is noteworthy because of the variations from that type in the English poem. Whether or not these variations are to be explained by differences in the temperament of the poets or of the Italian and English nations, or by differences in political and economic, philosophical and religious environment, the fact remains that under Spenser's hands the romantic epos undergoes a development, the nature and methods of which, as well as the causes, are of importance in determining the species of growth that fall under epic development. When it can be shown that the influences under which Spenser produced these variations are normal and general in their nature, and that they have acted to produce similar variations in the growth of the epic elsewhere, or of other types, the aim of the comparative study of this aspect of the epic will have been largely attained. And in determining the answers to these questions the nature and methods of variation of the minor Elizabethan epics become of great importance and assistance. Those variations that they and the F. Q. have in common could not have originated in the idiosyncrasies of the individual poets, though they may have been due in part to the imitation by a group of a variation that arose from the idiosyncrasy of some one member of the group. — The student must be warned against the unscientific critic who doubts whether the F. Q. can be admitted into the ranks of the epic, or the ranks of the romantic epic. For influence of Spenser upon his successors in the epic, — allegorical, historical, and religious, — see H. E. Cory, Spenser, the School of the Fletchers, and Milton (*Univ. Calif. Pubs. Mod. Philol.*, vol. II, No. 5, pp. 311–373, June 17, 1912).

G. *The Epics of Milton.*

For Milton, as for Spenser, detailed bibliography may here be omitted, but a few important references are given below. The best edition of the poems is that of D. Masson (3 vols. Lond.: 1882, 1893). Other editions are those of J. Mitford (8 vols. Lond.: 1851); H. J. Todd (2d ed. 7 vols. Lond.: 1809); W. V. Moody (Boston: 1900). *Translations:*

German versions by Bodmer (1732), Zachariä (1762), Böttger (1846), Eitner (1867), and — best of all — by Schumann (1877); French versions by Dupré de Saint-Maur (prose, 1729), Louis Racine (1755), J. Mosneron (prose, 1787), Chateaubriand (prose, 1836), J. Dessiaux (1867), *et al.* (see J. M. Telleen, Milton dans la litt. française, Paris: 1904).

Some of the more important questions to be considered in connection with Paradise Lost and Paradise Regained are as follows: What are the sources of the poems? Indebtedness to Caedmon, Du Bartas, Tasso, Vondel, Grotius, Andreini? Relative indebtedness of the poems to Greek and Hebrew (Biblical) sources? Relation to Homer, Hesiod, and Virgil? to other ancient epics? The adaptability of Christian mysteries to epic machinery as revealed in these poems? as revealed in other attempts in epic form? (Cf. above, § 9, V, A.) The relation of the peculiar characteristics of Milton's epics to the culture of his times? to his personal idiosyncrasies? Influence of the poems upon European literature, especially upon Klopstock? Vitality of the poems as variations in epic growth, — have the variations they represent persisted in the general development of the type? Do they, like other great epics, represent an order of society, religion, and politics at the moment of decline from a zenith of power and growth? Do the poems, in relation to the Puritan Age, show how in modern times the growth of a great social poem is abbreviated? and may this abbreviation be contrasted with the century-long development of communal epics? Or should Milton's epics be regarded as the long-deferred climax of an evolving artistic effort coterminous with the gradual development of Christian theology?

References. The following works may be mentioned: Addison (see above, § 8); W. D. Armes, An Analysis of Milton's P. L., — brief and convenient, touching upon subject and purpose, sources, structure, cosmology, characters, style, and versification (*Univ. Calif. Syllabus Series*, No. 66. 1916); W. Bagehot, John Milton (in Literary Studies. Ed. by R. R. Hutton. 2d ed. 2 vols. Lond.: 1879); J. Bailey, Milton (N.Y.: 1915); A. Birrell, Obiter Dicta, 2d Series (N.Y.: 1887); S. A. Brooke, Milton (1879); Buff, Milton's P. L. in Verhältnis zur Aeneide, Ilias und Odyssee (Hof: 1905. Progr.); Chateaubriand, a chapter on Milton in the Essai sur la litt. anglaise (in the Œuvres complètes, vol. XXXIV. 36 vols. Paris: 1837); J. Clark, as noted above, § 11; H. Corson, Introduction to the Prose and Poetical Works of John Milton (N.Y.: 1899), containing a selection of autobiographical passages from Milton's writings; W. J. Courthope, Macaulay's Comparison of Dante and Milton (in vol. III of the *Proceedings of the British Academy*. Read Dec. 1908); S. von Gajšek, Milton und Caedmon (in *Wiener Beiträge zur engl. Phil.*, No. 35. 1911; cf. Wülker in *Anglia*, 4: 401. 1881); R. Garnett, Life of Milton (Lond.: 1890); Goethe and Schiller, Correspondence between (translated by L. Dora Schmitz. 2 vols. Lond.: 1877–79. Bohn's Lib. See Letter 636, Goethe on P.L.); S. Johnson, Life of Milton (many eds.); S. H. Gurteen, as noted above, § 8; Macaulay, Essay on Milton (see above, § 8); D. Masson, Life of Milton (6 vols. and Index. New ed. Lond.: 1881–94), the chief of the biographies; by the same, Introductions to P. L. and P. R. (in the Globe Ed. of M.'s Poetical Works. Lond.: 1877, etc.); by the same, The Three Devils and Other Essays (Lond.: 1874); Mullinger and Masterman, The Age of Milton (Lond.: 1897); T. N. Orchard, Milton's Astronomy (Lond.: 1913); C. G. Osgood, The Classical Mythology of Milton's English Poems (in *Yale Studies in English*, No. 8. 1900); M. Pattison, Life of Milton (N.Y.: 1880. E M L.); Pommrich, Milton's Verhältnis zu T. Tasso (Leipz.: 1902. Diss.); W. Raleigh, Milton (Lond.: 1900); *Quarterly Rev.*, Milton — On Christian Doctrine (32: 442–457. 1825); J. G. Robertson, Milton's Fame on the Continent (in vol. III of the *Proceedings of the British Academy*. Read Dec. 1908); Scrocca, Studio critico sul P. L. del Milton (Napoli: 1902); E. C. Stedman, Nature and Elements of Poetry (see above, § 8); A. Stern, Milton und seine Zeit (2 vols. Leipz.: 1877–79); Symonds, Milton, his Life and Times (Lond.: 1833); E. N. S. Thompson, Essays on Milton (New Haven: 1894); W. P. Trent, John Milton, A Short Study of his Life and Works (N.Y.: 1899). On Milton's prosody, see works by R. Bridges, Bridges and Stone, W. Thomas, etc.; also J. A. Symonds, The Blank Verse of Milton (*Fortn. Rev.*, 22: 767–781. 1874), and Saintsbury, Hist. Eng. Prosody, 2: 207–273 (Lond.: 1908). For further references on the sources of P. L., see Körting's Grundriss der Geschichte der englischen Lit., pp. 285–286, 287–288 (5th ed. Münster: 1910); in Körting's work the student will find extensive bibliography on other aspects of the poem also (see p. 282 ff.); see, too, the bibliography appended to Professor Saintsbury's article on Milton in the Camb. Hist. Eng. Lit., vol. VII; for works on the indebtedness of Milton to Vondel, see Betz-Baldensperger, La litt. comparée, essai bibliographique, p. 279 (2d ed. Strasbourg: 1904); Edmundson's Milton and Vondel (Lond.: 1885); C. L. van Noppen's Introduction to his translation of Vondel's Lucifer (Greensboro, N.C.: 1917); T. De Vries' Holland's Influence on English Language and Literature (Chicago: 1916). Several references on Milton have been given above, § 9, VII, D.

H. *Other English Epics.* For the Ossianic poems, and the resulting literature, see above, § 6, XI, E; also, XII; and below, X. For other English epics or epical narratives, see such poems as those mentioned above, § 7, VI; and the list of Arthurian poems given in D, above; also Tennyson's Idylls of the King, William Morris' Jason and Sigurd the Volsung, Lewis Morris' Epic of Hades, Sir Edwin Arnold's Light of Asia and Light of the World, Arnold's Sohrab and Rustum, Alfred Noyes' Drake; and, of American efforts, Timothy Dwight's Conquest of Canaan, Joel Barlow's Columbiad, and W. C. Wilkinson's Epic of Saul and Epic of Paul. The Evangeline and the Hiawatha of Longfellow are successful attempts at narrative poems of epical quality. The latter is interesting to the student of literary origins because of its adaptation of stories published by H. R. Schoolcraft in his Historical and Statistical Information respecting the History . . . of the Indian Tribes of the United States (6 vols. 1851–1857) and in his earlier works upon the Indians of the Northwest. For these poems and others see Dixon, *op. cit.*

X. Gaelic Epics.

For a catalogue of the epic literature of Ireland, see H. d'Arbois de Jubainville, Essai d'un catalogue de la littérature épique de l'Irlande (Paris: 1883). Bibliographical aid will also be found in the first volume of Morley's English Writers. In dealing with the Arthurian cycle the student should use the notes given above under Arthurian Romances (IX, D), under the French *Épopée Courtoise* (V, D), and below under the German Court Epics (XI, C, 2). For *translations* of Gaelic epics and epical material, see the following: C. S. Boswell, An Irish Precursor of Dante (Lond.: 1908); J. Dunn, The Ancient Irish Epic Tale Táin Bó Cúalnge (Lond., David Nutt), — "the queen of Irish epic tales"; E. Evans, Some Specimens of the Poetry of the Ancient

Welsh Bards (Lond.: 1764); L. W. Faraday, The Cattle-Raid of Cualnge, an Old Irish Prose-Epic (Lond.: 1904); Lady I. A. Gregory, Cuchulain of Muirthemne, the Story of the Men of the Red Branch of Ulster (Lond.: 1902); by the same, Gods and Fighting Men, the Story of the Taatha de Danaan and of the Fianna of Ireland, etc. (Lond.: 1904); Lady Guest, Mabinogion (1838); Eleanor Hull, The Cuchullin Saga in Irish Literature, etc. (Lond.: 1898); A. H. Leahy, Heroic Romances of Ireland (2 vols. Lond.: 1905–06); K. Meyer and A. Nutt, The Voyage of Bran (2 vols. Lond.: 1895–97); D. W. Nash, Taliesin, or the Bards and Druids of Britain (Lond.: 1858); Skene, Dean of Lismore's Book (Edinb.: 1862); Jos. O'Neill, The Cath Boinde, a Cuchulainn Saga (in *Ériu*, Dublin); J. Strachan and J. G. O'Keefe, The Táin Bó Cúailgne (in *Ériu*, Dublin); and the various editions of Ossian, — as, for instance, the Ossianic Poems by J. MacNeill (Dublin: 1908). For further materials of both original and critical nature, see the publications of the Irish Texts Society (Lond.: 1899 +), and the *Transactions of the Ossianic Society* (Dublin: 1854 +) and *Ériu* (Dublin: 1903 +).

The student will find ready aid in his approach to the Gaelic epic in the works of de Jubainville, Morley, Hull, Hyde, Maclean, and in the periodicals devoted to Celtic philology, — for all of which see the Appendix. A brief essay on the Epic of Ireland will be found in P. E. More's Shelburne Essays, First Series.

XI. **German Epics.**

For general apparatus — histories, bibliographies, collections, and periodicals — see above, § 6, XIII, and the Appendix.

A. *The Beginnings — Pagan Poetry.*

For references see above, § 6, XIII, A.

The existence of early heroic poetry is inferred from Tacitus' statement (Ann. II, 88; cf. Germ. 2) that in his day — the 1st century — songs were sung about the hero Arminius. And the fact that the national epic celebrates events that occurred during the great migrations and wars of the 5th century also is indirect evidence of the existence of heroic tradition (see, further, Paul, II, 1, pp. 53–55. 2d ed.). But of all this 'floating-poetry' nothing remains, unless we agree with Kögel and Bruckner (in Paul, II, 1, pp. 49–55) that the northern Wielandlied is an ancient ballad of Germanic origin.

B. *The Old High German Period* (*c.* 750–1050).

References above, § 6, XIII, A, B.

That the stirring events of the 5th century continued to be handed down in oral tradition during this period it is reasonable to suppose (see Paul, 86–89). What we possess of High German poetry of the 9th century, however, is not related to this tradition. Christian influence doubtless had not been favorable to the preservation of pagan legend and myth. The Ludwigslied is an historical ballad dealing with events of this period. The Evangelienbuch of Otfried of Weissenburg (*c.* 800–870) is a Christ-story told in a new spirit of Christian meekness. The Muspilli is a highly-colored vision of the Day of Judgment. On the Lied vom heiligen Georg see Paul, 122–123. But Low German poetry does present us in the Hildebrandslied with a story deriving from previous heroic tradition, — the only survival in German of the 'rhapsodic' epic of the heroic age, though the Anglo-Saxon Finnsburg and Waldere fragments are similar pieces which doubtless point to German originals or equivalents. To the Saxons also belong the Heliand and Genesis, epical versions of the Christ-story and of part of the Old Testament, wherein the fierce spirit of barbaric Teutonism is predominant. In the tenth century falls the Latin Waltharius (cf. the Anglo-Saxon Waldere, as noted above, IX, A) of Ekkehard, the subject and spirit of which are drawn from paganism, the manner from Virgil and Prudentius. The Latin Ruodlieb (*c.* 1030) is a forerunner of the later romances; and the Ecbasis Captivi (*c.* 940) is the earliest Beast epic. For other Latin poetry see Paul, 129 ff.

On the Ludwigslied, Evangelienbuch, and Muspilli see Paul, pp. 109–122; on the Hildebrandslied, Paul 71–81; on the old Saxon Biblical epic, Paul 93–109; on the Waltharius, Paul 81–86 and above, IV, F; on the Ruodlieb, Paul 136–138; on the Ecbasis Captivi, Paul 181–182, above, IV, F, and Foulet, as noted above, § 11. On these see also Manitius, Gesch. d. lat. Lit. des Mittelalters, Tl. I. Further references in Paul and Manitius.

C. *Middle High German Period* (1050–1350).

See above, § 6, XIII, C.

The activity of the *Spielleute* — wandering popular singers of popular lays, descendants of the jesters and minstrels of the previous period — was at first held in restraint by the monastic reform that spread from Cluny, but about 1160 the popular Germanic epical story reappeared in the romance of König Rother, which was followed by other *Spielmann* poems of more energy than taste (Orendel, Oswald, Salman und Morolf). Under the influence of the Crusades and of chivalry, and first of all by way of translation of French romances of chivalry, there developed an aristocratic epic of greater art and wider scope. Forerunners of this court epic were the Alexanderlied (*c.* 1130), the Herzog Ernst (*c.* 1180), the German version of the Chanson de Roland (Rolandslied, *c.* 1135), Eilhart von Oberge's Tristant (*c.* 1170) — which drew upon the Arthurian cycle with which the great poets of the court epic at its best were chiefly concerned — and the German Floris und Blancheflur. The first decade of the 13th century saw a great development of this romantic epos. Lifted into prominence practically by Heinrich von Veldeke's Germanizing of a French romantic version of the Aeneid, the type reached its climax in the memorable works of Hartmann von Aue, Wolfram von Eschenbach, and Gottfried von Strassburg. By feebler hands it continued to be written through the century, and came to a close in the first part of the 14th century.

But more important are the great national or folk epics — the Nibelungenlied, Gudrun, and others, including the lesser narrative poems of the Heldenbuch — deriving in their present form for the most part from the close of the 12th and the opening of the 13th century. These are made up of legendary and mythological materials of ancient Teutonic tradition, which must have been preserved in part by the *Spielleute*, but were now worked over in a heightened and dignified style to meet the social and literary fashions of the new chivalry.

We shall consider first the national and then the court epics.

1. *The National Epics.*

For the English student the most convenient orientation in the subject is supplied by M. B. Smith's Northern Hero Legends, which is a translation from O. L. Jiriczek's Deutsche Heldensage (in the Temple Primers Series. Lond.: 1902); see also G. Saintsbury, The Flourishing of Romance, Chap. VI (N. Y.: 1897), and the histories of German literature as previously noted (§ 6). But the best introductions are B. Symons, Heldensage (in Paul's Grundriss, 2: 1, 1–64. Strassburg: 1893); and, in the 2d ed. of Paul (1901–1909), F. Vogt, Mittelhochdeutsche Literatur (2: 1, 229–251). Other important works are: A. Bossert, La littérature allemande au moyen âge et les origines de l'épopée germanique (2d ed. Paris: 1882); S. Bugge, Studier over de Nordiske Gude ok Heltesagns Oprindelse (Christiania: 1881–89), which has been translated into German by O. Brenner, Studien über die Entstehung der nordischen Götter- und Heldensage (München: 1881–89); G. T. Dippold, Great Epics of Mediaeval Germany (Boston: 1882); O. Frick and F. Polack (see above, § 11); W. Grimm, Die deutsche Heldensage (Göttingen: 1829; 3d ed. Gütersloh: 1889); J. Grimm, Deutsche Mythologie (Göttingen: 1835; 3d ed. 1854, 2 vols.); by the same, Kleinere Schriften (4 vols. Berlin: 1881–87); C. A. W. Günther, Die deutsche Heldensage des Mittelalters, nebst der Sage vom Heiligen Gral (3d ed. Hannover: 1884); A. Heusler (see above, § 11); O. Hocker, Deutsche Heldensagen (Reutlingen: 1886); O. Jähnicke and others, Das deutsche Heldenbuch (5 vols. Berlin: 1866–70); W. P. Ker, Epic and Romance (2d ed. Lond.: 1908); A. Köhler, Ueber den Stand berufsmässiger Sänger im nationalen Epos germanischer Völker (in *Germania*, 15: 27–50); G. Kurth, Histoire poétique des Mérovingiens (Paris: 1893); J. M. Ludlow, Popular Epics of the Middle Ages (2 vols. Lond.: 1865); A. Lütjens, Der Zwerg in der deutschen Heldendichtung des Mittelalters (in *Germanistische Abhandlungen*, No. 38. Breslau: 1911); J. von Moerner, Die deutschen und französischen Heldengedichte des Mittelalters als Quelle für die Kulturgeschichte (Leipz.: 1886); W. Müller, Mythologie der deutschen Heldensage (Heilbr.: 1886. Cf. above, § 11); A. Rassmann, Die deutsche Heldensage (2 vols. 2d ed. Hannover: 1863); W. Scherer, Geschichte der deutschen Dichtung im 11. und 12. Jahrh. (in *Quellen und Forsch.*, Bd. XII. Strassburg: 1875); A. E. Schönbach, Das Christentum in der altdeut. Heldendichtung (Graz: 1897); J. L. Uhland, Gesammelte Schriften zur Geschichte der Dichtung und Sage, vols. I, II (ed. by Holland. 8 vols. Stuttgart: 1865–73);

K. Weinhold, Altnordisches Leben (Leipz.: 1856); by the same, Die deutschen Frauen in dem Mittelalter (2 vols. 2d ed. Wien: 1882).

(*a*) *Nibelungenlied.*

For bibliographies see R. von Muth, Einleitung in das Nibelungenlied (2d ed. Ed. by J. W. Nagl. Paderborn: 1907. See pp. 1–31); Goedeke, Grundriss zur Geschichte der deutschen Dichtung (2d ed., vol. I, p. 183 ff.); F. Zarncke, Das Nibelungenlied (6th ed. 1887. See p. lxi ff.); L. Lichtenberger, Le poème et la légende des Nibelungen (Paris: 1891. See pp. 436–440 Critical works; 415–422 Sources); T. Abeling, Das Nibelungenlied und seine Literatur (2 Pts. Leipz.: 1907–09; *Teutonia*, ed. W. Uhl, vol. 7, and Suppl.), — the bibliographical section, with 1272 references, is useful (cf. the review in *Lit. Zentralbl.*, 1907, No. 35), but the original contributions are criticized severely (see *Literaturbl. f. germ. und roman. Phil.*, 1908, Nos. 3, 4; 1910, No. 12). For the works that have appeared since 1879 see the *Jahresbericht über die Erscheinungen auf dem Gebiete der germ. Phil.*, herausgegeben von der Gesellschaft für deutsche Phil. (Berlin: 1880 +); see also H. Fischer, Die Forschungen über das Nibelungenlied seit Lachmann (Leipz.: 1874). — For facsimiles of the manuscripts see Lassberg's Liedersaal, vol. IV, and Könnecke's Bilderatlas d. deutsch. Lit. On the interrelations of the MSS. see W. Braune, Die Handschriftenverhältnisse des Nibelungenliedes (in Paul and Braune's *Beiträge*, XXV), and Kettner (in *Zeitschr. für deutsch. Phil.*, XXXIV). — English works dealing with the poem (translations and critical essays) are carefully collected in a scholarly essay by F. E. Sandbach, The Nibelungenlied and Gudrun in England and America (Lond.: 1904). Students cannot do better than consult this work first of all. In addition to bibliographical details there is an introduction tracing the story of the poem and outlining the theories of its composition; also a chapter on the influence of the Nibelungenlied on English literature. Students who are unfamiliar with the poem and its critical apparatus will find of particular value the works of Muth and Lichtenberger mentioned above, Paul's Grundriss, the excellent little work of Jiriczek, also noted above, and the Einleitung to Werner Hahn's edition (Berlin u. Stuttgart). An outline of the story for beginners and of Wagner's adaptation in the Ring of the Nibelung will be found in Gayley's Classic Myths (rev. ed. Boston: 1911), pp. 405–430; for records and commentary see pp. 460–461, 536–537. Translations of the Wagner work have been made by F. Jameson (Schott and Co. Lond.: n. d.) and by R. Rankin.

The Nibelungenlied is one of the most important of the natural, as distinguished from literary or artificial, epics. As such, and as representative of Germanic epical expression, it reasonably falls into position beside the Homeric epics, although the poetic values of the Greek and German poems are by no means on a par. A list of works dealing with the comparison of the Nibelungenlied and the Homeric epics is here appended. The comparison involves, of course, the economic, social, political, and religious backgrounds; the methods of composition; the nature of the narrative art; the poetic value of the poems; etc. From the similarity of conditions antecedent and concomitant it would follow that the problems of the poems are similar, and the student may consult what has already been said concerning these problems (see above, 1).

On the comparison of the Nibelungenlied with the Homeric epics see L. Blume, Das Ideal des Helden und des Weibes bei Homer mit Rücksicht auf das deutsche Alterthum (Wien: 1874. Progr.); F. Böhm, Ilias und Nibel., eine Parallele (Znaim: 1886); H. M. Chadwick, The Heroic Age (1912; noted above, § 11), the most important work on the subject; F. H. Hedge, Hours with the German Classics, Chap. IV (Boston: 1886); A. Lang, as noted above, § 11; W. Müller, Zur Mythologie der griechischen und deutschen Heldensage (Heilbr.: 1889. Cf. above, § 11); A. Nusch, Zur Vergleichung des Nibel. mit der Ilias (Speier: 1863. Progr.); J. Pepöck, Zur Charakteristik griechischer und deut. Helden im Volksepos (Pilsen: 1889. Progr.); W. Scherer, Über das Nibel. (in Vorträge und Aufsätze z. Gesch. d. geistigen Lebens, etc. Berlin: 1874. See pp. 101–123); K. Schnorf, Der mythische Hintergrund im Gudrunliede und in der Odyssee (Zürich: 1879); M. Turk, Zur Vergleichung der Iliade und des Nibel. (Kronstadt: 1873. Progr.); K. Zell, Über die Iliade und das Nibel. (Karlsruhe: 1843).

The saga of the Niblungs has been preserved in several forms: (1) the Norwegian-Icelandic version, contained in (*a*) the Elder or Poetic Edda, (*b*) the Younger or Snorra Edda, and (*c*) the Saga of the Volsungs; (2) the German version, contained (*a*) in High German poems, viz. the Nibelungenlied, the Klage, the Seyfriedslied, and (*b*) in the Low German Thidrekssaga and many old Danish heroic ballads (Kjaempeviser). The Beowulf also contains a reference to the saga. The comparative study of these sources has been carried far, and is of particular interest in revealing more or less primitive stages in the development of the story and its later modification in the epic form of the Nibelungenlied. The excision of the more marvellous elements of the primitive saga and the reliance upon dramatic motives of character and will especially distinguish the epic form; but note how some of the primitive elements are introduced, awkwardly enough, into the fourth Aventiure. The original home of the saga, its development, and the age of the different versions afford excellent topics for study and speculation.

For an admirable introduction to the variants of the saga — their origin and development — see Smith-Jiriczek, as already noted; further discussion in Lichtenberger, Abeling, and other works mentioned at the head of this subdivision.

The sources of the saga have been explained as historical, mythical, and mixed. The historical sources are evident in the second part of the saga: the destruction of the Burgundian kings by Attila (first half of the 5th century). But the marvellous elements in the story of Siegfried's youth, up to his coming to the Burgundian court, have persuaded some scholars that the story was originally a nature-myth, "modified into a heroic saga after the introduction of Christianity, and intermingled with historical elements." This theory is in accord with the theories of myth that were popularized by the Grimm brothers, but it is not borne out by recent anthropological investigations, such as Professor Ridgeway has adduced in his works on Greek tragedy (The Origin of Tragedy, etc. Cambridge Univ. Press: 1910; The Dramas and Dramatic Dances of non-European Races, etc. Cambridge: 1915).

See W. A. Phillips, Art. Nibelungenlied, Encyc. Brit.; Smith-Jiriczek, as noted above; Hahn's Einleitung, pp. 35–47; Shumway, Nibelungenlied, p. xxvii ff., xlix. On the mythological interpretation see K. Lachmann, Kritik der Sage von den Nib. (*Rhein. Mus.*, Nos. 249, 250. 1829; republished in his Zu den Nib. . . . Anmerkungen, 1836); R. von Muth, Einleitung (as noted above); W. Müller, Versuch einer mythol. Erklärung der Nib. (Berlin: 1841), and Mythologie der deutschen Heldensage (Heilbronn: 1866); W. Wilmanns (in *Anzeiger f. deutsch. Alterthum*, 18: 72, 31: 77). — On the historical sources: J. Leichtlen, Neuaufgefundenes Bruchstück des Nibel. (Freiburg i. B.: 1820); R. C. Boer, Untersuchungen über d. Entwicklung d. Nibelungensage (in *Zeitschr. f. deut. Phil.*, 37: 289, 438. 1905; 38: 39. 1906. Also, expanded, 3 vols. Halle: 1906–09); T. Abeling, as noted above.

The question of single or aggregate authorship, imported from the Homeric discussion, has played its part in the critical discussion of the German poem.

The following are the chief defenders of the theory that the Nibelungenlied was made up from many short lays: K. Lachmann, Über die ursprüngliche Gestalt des Gedichts von der Nibelungen Noth (Berlin: 1816; reprinted in his Kleine Schriften, pp. 1–80), the first application of the Wolfian hypothesis (cf. above, § 11, Wolf) to the Nibelungenlied; by the same, Zu den Nibelungen und zur Klage, Anmerkungen (Berlin: 1836); R. Henning, Nibelungenstudien (in *Quellen und Forsch.*, Bd. XXXI. Strassburg: 1883); E. Kettner, Die österreichische Nibelungendichtung (Berlin: 1897); K. Müllenhoff, Zur Geschichte der Nibelunge Not (Braunschweig: 1855), one of the chief followers of Lachmann; W. Müller, Über die Lieder von den Nibelungen (Göttingen: 1845), which is opposed to the theory of the unity of authorship, but is also in disagreement with Lachmann's hypothesis (cf. W. Wilmanns, Beiträge zur Erklärung und Geschichte des Nibel. Halle: 1877). — The chief defenders of the unity of the poem, and their important works, are as follows: K. Bartsch, Untersuchungen über das Nibel. (Wien: 1865), — that an older manuscript had been worked over into later form; H. Fischer, Nibelungenlied oder Nibelungenlieder (Hannover: 1859); A. Holtzmann, Untersuchungen über das Nibel. (Stuttgart: 1854), the first work openly to combat the theory of Lachmann, and to advance the idea of the unity of aim and authorship of the whole poem as the manuscripts give it; H. Paul, Zur Nibelungenfrage (Halle: 1877); F. Pfeiffer, Der Dichter des Nibel. (Ein Vortrag gehalten in der feierlichen Sitzung der kais. Akad. der Wiss. 30 Mai 1862: Wien), an attempt to prove that Kürenberg was the author of the poem (cf. Vollmöller's refutation in his Kürenberg und die Nibelungen. Stuttgart: 1874); F. Zarncke, Zur Nibelungenfrage (Leipz.: 1854); by the same, Beiträge zur Erklärung und Geschichte des Nibel. (Leipz.: 1856), — in agreement with the general theory of Holtzmann. See also A. Lang, Homer and the Epic, Chap. XVI (noted above, § 11). For an ingenious combination and extension of previous theories see the work of Abeling, already noted, and summarized in the Art. Nibelungenlied, Encyc. Brit.

Editions and Translations. The standard editions of the original text are as follows: K. Bartsch, Der Nibelunge Nôt, etc., a critical ed., with recension of manuscript B (2 Pts. Leipz.: 1870–80); K. Lachmann, Der Nibelunge Noth, mit der Klage, etc. (1826; 5th ed. Berlin: 1878 — recension of manuscript A); P. Piper, Die Nibelungen (Berlin: 1889); F. Zarncke, Das Nibelungenlied (6th ed. Leipz.: 1887 — recension of manuscript C). — The principal *translations* into English are those of M. Armour, The Fall of the Nibelungs, etc. (prose, Lond.: 1897); J. Birch, Das Nibelungenlied, translated into English verse after Lachmann's text (Berlin: 1848; 4th ed. München: 1895); A. Forestier (Annie A. Woodward), Echoes from Mist-Land, etc. (Chicago: 1877), a very free translation; A. G. Foster-Barham, The Nibelungen Lied, etc. (2d ed. Lond.: 1893); Alice Horton, The Lay of the Nibelungs, etc. (Bohn's Lib. Lond.: 1898); W. N. Lettsom, The Nibelungenlied, etc. (2d ed. Lond.: 1874; 4th ed. N.Y.: 1903); G. H. Needler (N.Y.: 1904), very good; D. B. Shumway (N.Y.: 1910), an excellent prose translation, with an informing introduction. The best verse translations are those of Horton and Lettsom. For a criticism of the various English translations, see F. E. Sandbach, as noted above. Modern German translations are numerous; some of the best are by Simrock (in most frequent use), L. Freytag, Engelmann, Piper, Bartsch, Marbach, Gerlach, Hahn, and Schröter. A complete list of the German adaptations of the Nibelungen story by modern authors will be found in K. Rehorn's Die deutsche Sage von den Nibelungen in der deutschen Poesie (Frankfurt a. M.: 1882); for English adaptations, see Sandbach, pp. 126–135.

References. Other works of more or less aid follow: T. Carlyle, The Nibelungen Lied (in *Westm. Rev.*, 24: 1–45. Lond.: 1831); the first five chaps. of the work by Dippold, mentioned above, and the proper parts of the other general works mentioned in the same place; J. Clark, A History of Epic Poetry (Edinb.: 1900. See Chap. IV), a very superficial account; Sir G. W. Cox and E. H. Jones, Popular Romances of the Middle Ages (Lond.: 1871); J. Crueger, Der Entdecker der Nibelungen (Frankf.: 1883); K. Droege, Die Vorstufe unseres Nibelungenliedes (in *Zeitschr. f. deut. Altertum*, 51: 177–218); H. Fischer, Die Forschungen über das Nibelungenlied seit Lachmann (Leipz.: 1874); R. Fischer (see above, § 8); C. H. Genung, The Nibelungenlied (in

Warner's Library of the World's Best Lit.); J. Gostwick, The Spirit of German Poetry, etc. (Lond.: 1845); G. Gruener, The Nibelungenlied and Saga in Modern Poetry (in *Pubs. Mod. Lang. Ass. Amer.*, vol. XI, pp. 220–257. Baltimore: 1896); F. H. von der Hagen (see any library catalogue for the numerous works by Hagen; or, better, see under Hagen in the works of bibliography mentioned at the opening of this division; C. von Klenze (see above, § 11); E. de Laveleye (see above, § 11); J. M. Ludlow, Popular Epics of the Middle Ages, etc. (Lond.: 1865. See vol. I, Pt. II, Chap. VI, p. 105 ff.); M. W. Macdowall, Epics and Romances of the Middle Ages (Lond.: 1882); Fr. Vogt, in Paul's Grundriss, II, 232; E. Mogk, Die älteste Einwanderung der Nibelungensaga nach Norden (Festgabe für Hildebrand), see also L. de Monge (see above, § 8); R. Nadrowski, Über die Entstehung des Nibelungenliedes (Festschr. z. 70. Geburtst. O. Schades. Königsberg: 1896), an application of Grote's Homeric theory to the Nibel.; F. Panzer, Studien z. germanischen Sagengeschichte, II. Sigfrid (München: 1912; see *Lit. Zentralbl.*, 1912, No. 35); H. Patzig, Zur Geschichte des Sigfridsmythus (Berlin: 1898); H. Paul, Die Thidrekssaga und das Nibelungenlied (in *Sitzungsberichte der bayr. Akademie der Wissensch.*, 1900); L. Pollak, Untersuchungen über die Sigfridsagen (Diss., Berlin: 1910); G. Radtke, Die epische Formel im Nibel. (Paris: 1891); A. Rassmann, Die Niflungasaga und das Nibel. (Heilbr.: 1877); A. Réville, L'épopée des Nibelungen (in *Rev. des Deux Mondes*, Dec. 15, 1866); A. G. Richey, The Teutonic and the Celtic Epic (in *Fraser's Mag.*, 89: 336 ff. Lond.: 1874); G. K. J. Schmedes, Stil der Epen Rother, Nibel. und Gudrun (Kiel: 1893); G. F. van Schweringen, The Lit. Types of Men in the Germanic Hero Sagas (in *Jr. Eng. and Germ. Phil.*, 14: 212. 1915; cf. 15: 177. 1916); J. Sime, Art. on the Nibel. (in Encyc. Brit., 9th ed., vol. XVII); J. Strobl, Die Entstehung der Gedichte von der Nibelunge Not und der Klage (Halle: 1911; cf. *Litbl. germ. roman. Phil.*, 36: 72); G. Vigfusson and F. York Powell, Sigfred-Arminius and Other Papers (Oxford: 1886); C. Voretzsch, Zur Gesch. der Nibelungensage in Frankreich und Deutschland (in *Zeitschr. f. deut. Altertum*, 51: 39–58); H. W. Weber, Der (*sic*) Nibel., the Song of the Nibelungen (in Weber, Jamieson, and Scott's Illustrations of Northern Antiquities from the Earlier Teutonic and Scandinavian Romances, etc. (Edinb.: 1814. See p. 167 ff.); B. W. Wells, Sigfred-Arminius (in *Mod. Lang. Notes*, 3: 124. Baltimore: 1888); J. L. Weston, Legends of the Wagner Drama (Lond.: 1896); W. Wilmanns, Der Untergang der Nibelungen in alter Sage und Dichtung (Berlin: 1903), — five stages of growth; E. Wolff, Ueber den Stil des Nibel. (in Verhandl. der 40.

Versamml. deut. Philologen, p. 259 ff. Leipz.: 1890); L. Wolf, Der groteske und hyperbol. Stil des mhd. Volksepos (in *Palaestra*, No. 25. 1903). Much of the most valuable material will be found in the German philological periodicals, which the advanced student should carefully consult.

(*b*) *Gudrun.*

For bibliography see K. Breul, Handy Bibliographical Guide (Lond.: 1895); Paul's Grundriss; A. Fécamp, Le poème de Gudrun (Paris: 1892); and the *Jahresb. über d. Ersch. auf d. Geb. d. germ. Philol.* — The chief *editions* are: K. Bartsch, Kudrun (5th ed. Leipz.: 1885. In Pfeiffer's Deutsche Klassiker des Mittelalters); E. Martin, Kudrun (2d ed. Halle: 1902. In Zacher's Germanistische Handbibliothek); B. Symons, Kudrun (Halle: 1883. In Paul's Altdeutsche Textbibliothek). — English *translation* by Mary P. Nichols, Gudrun, a Mediaeval Epic Translated from the Middle High German (Boston: 1889), for criticism of which see Sandbach, pp. 163–170. Gudrun, a Story of the North Sea, by Emma Letherbow (Edinb.: 1863), is a very free version and adaptation of the poem (cf. Sandbach, pp. 173–176). Some of the translations into modern German are by Simrock (15th ed. Stuttgart: 1884), Klee (Leipz.: 1878), Kamp (Berlin: 1890), Löschhorn (Halle: 1891), Hübbe (Hamburg: 1892), Legerlotz (Bielefeld: 1893). For modern adaptations see S. Benedict, Die Gudrunsage in der neueren deutschen Literatur (Rostock: 1902).

English students will find convenient introductions to the poem in Sandbach's work and in Smith-Jiriczek's Northern Hero Legends, both mentioned above. Of other works the following should be consulted, though the works in English are for the most part of little value: K. Bartsch, Beiträge zur Geschichte und Kritik der Kudrun (Wien: 1865); M. Carriere, Die Kunst im Zusammenhang der Kulturentwickelung (5 vols. Leipz.: 1863–73. See vol. III, ii, 337–342); F. Carter, The Last Work on the Gudrundichtung (in the *New Englander*, 34: 253–273. New Haven: 1875), a review of a work by Wilmanns; Sir G. W. Cox and E. H. Jones, as cited in the last division; the material in Dippold (cited above), — an exception to the stricture on works in English just made; A. Fécamp's work, already mentioned for bibliography, — the most important of the works on the Gudrun (in *Bibliothèque de l'École des Hautes Études*, etc., vol. XC); K. Francke, Social Forces in German Literature (3d ed. N.Y.: 1899. See pp. 82–84), — not very much on the Gudrun, but of value in an indirect and general way; J. Gibb, Gudrun and Other Stories from the

Epics of the Middle Ages (2d ed. Lond.: 1883), — popular and juvenile; A. Griesmann, Einführung in das Nibel. und die Gudrun (Leipz.: 1880); W. Grimm, Einleitung zur Vorlesung über Gudrun (in Kleinere Schriften, vol. IV, pp. 524–576); J. Haupt, Untersuchungen zur deutschen Sage, I. Untersuch. zur Gudrun (2d ed. Wien: 1874); O. Heinrich, Ueber die Kudrunsage und das Kudrunepos (in *Ungar. Revue*, 5: 295–297); H. Keck, Die Gudrunsage, etc. (Leipz.: 1867); E. Kettner, Der Einfluss des Nibelungenlieds auf die Gudrun (in *Zeitschr. für deut. Philol.*, 23: 145 ff.); G. Klee, Zur Hildesage (Leipz.: 1873); J. M. Ludlow, as cited in the previous division, — an untrustworthy work; E. Martin, Bemerkungen zur Gudrun (Halle: 1867); K. Müllenhoff, Kudrun, die echten Teile des Gedichts (Kiel: 1845), — applies Lachmann's *Liedertheorie* to the Gudrun (cf. E. Martin's edition of the poem); F. Panzer, Hilde-Gudrun, etc. (Halle: 1901), — a valuable work that holds to the theory of individual authorship; F. Reichardt, Zur Charakteristik des Nibel., Vergleich des epischen Stils des Nibel. mit dem der Kudrun (Aschersleben: 1881. Progr.); H. Rückert, Über das Epos von Gudrun (in his Kleinere Schriften, vol. I, pp. 180–211. Weimar: 1877); J. Sime (see above, under the Nibelungenlied); L. Uhland, Schriften zur Geschichte der Dichtung und Sage (8 vols. Stuttgart: 1865 +. See I, 75–80, 88, 110–111, 154–155, 157, 272–273, 327–332, 451–452; VI, 58; VII, 278–285, 536–538, — citations from Fécamp); F. Vogt (in Paul's Grundriss, 2d ed., 2: 1, 242–244); W. Widmann, Zur Kudrun, mythisches und historisches (Görz: 1873. Progr.); W. Wilmanns, Entwickelung der Kudrundichtung (Halle: 1873).

(*c*) For other epical materials of a national sort, especially the three Middle High German romances concerning Dietrich von Bern (Theodoric the Great, *ob.* 526), which are contained in the 2d vol. of the Heldenbuch (Berlin: 1866–73), see Smith-Jiriczek (61–88) and Paul (2: 1, 88–89, 244–251). The allied Ermanarich saga is only alluded to in High German poems, but exists in Low German and Norse forms (Smith-Jiriczek 88–91; Paul 2: 1, 87–88). Other South German epics tell the stories of Ortnit and Wolfdietrich (vols. 3, 4, of the Heldenbuch; Smith-Jiriczek 97–110; Paul 249–251). The High German romance of König Rother, which has been mentioned above, also handles national materials in a national spirit (ed. Rückert, 1872; Bahder, 1884; see Smith-Jiriczek 110–115; Paul 2: 1, 174–175).

2. *The Court Epics; Epical Romances; Romances of Chivalry.*

For the German courtly epic or metrical romance of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries (embracing the works of Heinrich von Veldeke, Hartmann von Aue, Wolfram von Eschenbach, Gottfried von Strassburg, etc.) see Paul's Grundriss (2d ed., 2: 1, 187–208), and P. Genelin, Unsere höfischen Epen und ihre Quellen (Innsbruck: 1891). Sufficient bibliography is given in Paul; see also Betz-Baldensperger, La litt. comparée, essai bibliographique, pp. 22–31 (2d ed. Strasbourg: 1904), — a list of monographs on the various poems.

In studying these court epics or epical romances the student will find himself confronted with a set of problems similar to those involved in the study of the French *épopée courtoise* (see above, V, D). The relation of the German romances of chivalry to the earlier national epic is only one example of the general relation of the epical romances to the popular epics. It may be somewhat hazardous to say that the relations of epic and metrical romance have not yet been scientifically explained; but the literary scientist will find that the usual explanations fall short of expounding those relations in terms of growth, in laws of literary development. Obvious differences and similarities in individual and sometimes cognate literatures have been noted and described; the broader induction from the general field of interrelations — Greek as well as medieval European and English, and oriental — if there be such, yet remains to be drawn. It is a gigantic task toward the fulfilment of which the student can at least contribute by systematically analyzing carefully defined cross-sections of the literatures concerned. — The minor problems connected with the study of the romantic epics of medievalism are those of sources, distribution, borrowings, textual provenience.

The following are the more important *editions* of separate authors: (*a*) of Veldeke, the Eneit, O. Behagel (Heilbronn: 1882); (*b*) of Hartmann von Aue, F. Bech (2d ed. 3 vols. Leipz.: 1893); (*c*) of Wolfram von Eschenbach, K. Bartsch (2d ed. Leipz.: 1875–1877) and A. Leitzmann (Halle: 1902); (*d*) of Gottfried von Strassburg, R. Bechstein (3d ed. Leipz.: 1890–91).

For additional information concerning the various authors and their poems, see: (*a*) On Veldeke's Eneit, H. Roetteken's Die epische Kunst, H. von Veldeke und Hart. von Aue (Halle: 1887). (*b*) On Hartmann von Aue's Der arme Heinrich, Iwein, and Erec: G. Jeske, Die Kunst Hartmanns von Aue als Epiker, verglichen mit der seiner Nachahmer (Diss. Greifswald: 1909); F. Piquet, Étude sur H. d'Aue (Paris: 1898); L. Schmid, Des Minnesängers H. von Aues Stand, Heimat, etc. (Tübingen: 1874); A. Schönbach, Über H. von Aue (Graz: 1894). (*c*) On Wolfram von Eschenbach: for bibliography of works connected with the Parzival and with the Titurel fragments, Bötticher, Die Wolfram-Literatur seit Lachmann (Berlin: 1880), and F. Panzer, Bibliographie zu W. von Eschenbach (München: 1897). Of translations of the Parzival, the best are by W. Hertz (Stuttgart: 1898) and J. L. Weston (2 vols. Lond.: 1894). The latter is the first English verse translation of the German poem. For critical discussion see K. Bartsch, Wolframs v. Esch. Parzival als psychologisches Epos (in Gesam. Vorträge und Aufsätze, pp. 250–317. Freiburg u. Tüb.: 1883); G. Bötticher, Das Hohelied vom Rittertum (Berlin: 1886), on the composition of the Parzival; Frick and Polack (see above, § 11); C. A. W. Günther, Die deutsche Heldensage des Mittelalters, nebst der Sage vom Heiligen Gral (3d ed. Hannover: 1884); P. Hagen, Wolfram und Kiot (in *Zeitschr. f. deut. Phil.*, 38, 1 and 2; also Halle: 1906), — suggests an original belonging to the French epic cycle (cf. *Literaturbl. f. germ. u. roman. Phil.*, 1908, Nos. 3, 4); F. Hoffmann, Erläuterung zu W. v. Esch. (Leipz.: 1909); A. Nutt, Studies on the Legend of the Holy Grail (Lond.: 1888); San Marte, Leben und Dichten W. v. Esch. (2 vols. 2d ed. Leipz.: 1858); E. Wechssler, Die Sage vom Heil. Gral in ihrer Entwickelung bis auf R. Wagner's Parsifal (Halle: 1898), contains a short bibliography and is a useful work in other respects as well. (*d*) On Gottfried von Strassburg's Tristan und Isolde: for an excellent translation into modern form, W. Hertz (Stuttgart: 1901); for discussion, W. Golther, Die Sage von Tristan und Isolde (München: 1887); J. Kelemina, Untersuchungen zur Tristansage (Leipz.: 1910; in *Teutonia*, 16); E. Kölbing, Die nordische und die engl. Version der Tristansage (Heilbr.: 1878–83); M. M. Mann, Die Frauenverehrung in der höf. Epik nach G. von Strassburg (in *Jr. Eng. and Germ. Phil.*, 12: 355. 1913); F. Piquet, L'originalité de G. de Strasbourg dans son poème de Tristan et Isolde (Lille: 1905); K. W. Röttiger, Der heutige Stand der Tristanforschung (Hamburg: 1897. Progr.); R. Zenker, Die Tristansage und das persische Epos von Wîs und Râmîn (in *Roman. Forsch.*, 29: 321–369. 1911; cf. *Romania*, 40: 114). For later German poems dealing with the Arthurian cycle and the material of Britain in general, see Maccallum's Tennyson's Idylls of the King, etc. (N.Y.: 1894). (*e*) For the bibliography of the lesser writers of the metrical romance of love and chivalry, see vol. I, pp. 336–337, of Vogt and Koch, Gesch. d. deutsch. Lit. von d. ältesten Zeiten bis zur Gegenwart (2 vols. Leipz.: 1904).

D. *Early New High German Period* (1350–1700).

See above, § 6, XIII, D.

During this period epical writing languished, and though the patient student may have zeal to follow in detail the history of the major narrative poem across four centuries, he will probably secure but scant results for his labor. First among matters to be considered is the gradual decadence of the court epic and metrical romance through sporadic revivals and parodies till finally prose romances take their place (see Paul, 2d ed., 2: 1, 287 ff., and histories of German literature as listed in the Appendix). The rise of the satirical beast epic (Reynke de Vos, 1498) should be studied comparatively. For the most minute and best comparative study see L. Foulet's Roman de Renard (Paris: 1914), and for a list of authorities on the animal epic, the notice of Foulet in § 11, above. — As the epic decays, however, the historical ballad develops with large freedom and success. In the latter part of the period, certain abortive attempts to write in the epic manner may be noted (e.g., Opitz's Zlatna, 1623).

E. *The Eighteenth Century*.

See above, § 6, XIII, E.

1. The epics produced under the pseudo-classical influence of Gottsched (see above, *loc. cit.*), such as Schönaich's Hermann oder das befreyte Deutschland — highly praised by the German followers of Boileau and the French tradition in criticism — are but formal, uninspired exercises.

2. *Klopstock's Messias*. The Messias raises again the moot question of the adaptability of the Christian religion to epic treatment (cf. the Miltonic epics and the Anglo-Saxon and

Saxon Christian epics, and Italian and French Renaissance criticism). The nature of the relation of the Messias to Paradise Lost is a more particular question. The place of Klopstock's poem in general epic development gives rise to another general question, suggesting the difference between the literary epic of the later period and that of Renaissance times. The influence of the poem in German literature is a matter of common knowledge, already touched upon in § 6, XIII, E, above.

For a convenient edition of the Messias see Klopstock's Werke, ed. A. Hamel, in Kürschner's Deutsche National-Litt. See the following: E. Bailly, Étude sur la vie et les œuvres de Klopstock (Paris: 1888. Bibliography, pp. 443–447); C. F. Benkowitz, Der Messias von Klopstock, ästhetisch beurtheilt und verglichen mit der Iliade, der Aeneide und dem Verlornen Paradiese (Breslau: 1797), an example of the naïve criticism of its time (cf. A. W. Schlegel's review of the book, contained in vol. XI, p. 157, of Böcking's edition of Schlegel's Werke); Frick and Polack (see above, § 11), containing a brief account and synopsis of the Messias; H. Gelzer, Die neuere deutsche National-Litteratur nach ihren ethischen und religiösen Gesichtspunkten, Tl. I (3d ed. Leipz.: 1858); A. Hamel, Klopstock-Studien (3 vols. Rostock: 1879 — 1880); by the same, the introduction to his edition of the Werke, mentioned above; J. W. Loebell, Die Entwicklung der deutschen Poesie von Klopstock's erstem Auftreten bis zu Goethe's Tode, vol. I (Braunschweig: 1856); F. Muncker, Klopstock (Stuttgart: 1893); Saint-Marc Girardin, De l'épopée chrétienne jusqu'à Klopstock (in *Rev. des Deux Mondes*, March 1, 1849; Aug. 15, 1849; April 1, 1850); F. Schlegel, Lectures on the History of Lit. (English trans. in Bohn's Lib. Lond.: 1876. See Lect. XV, pp. 339–350); R. Tombo, Jr., Ossian in Germany (in *Columbia Univ. Germanic Studies*, vol. I, No. II. N.Y.: 1901); further bibliography in Bartels' Handbuch zur Geschichte der deutschen Literatur (2d ed. Leipz.: 1909), pp. 189–193.

F. *Other German Epics and Narrative Poems.* German literature, like other modern literatures, possesses many literary epics or, at any rate, many long narrative poems. The student can inform himself by turning to any good history of German literature. For the idyllic strain in folk song, in the Meistersinger, in von Kleist, Heinrich Voss (the Luise), etc., see above, § 6, XIII. On Renaissance epic see J. E. Gillet in *Jr. Eng. and Germ. Phil.*, 15 : 35, 1916. The most important of the narrative poems not already mentioned is the Hermann und Dorothea of Goethe — an epyllion, or heroic idyl, of humble life. Humboldt's criticism of it has been mentioned above (§ 8). The student will be interested in comparing with this the account of the poem by A. W. Schlegel (see vol. XI, pp. 183–221, of the Sämmtliche Werke. Ed. by E. Böcking. Leipz.: 1847). On Wieland's epic attempts, poetic romances, and romantic epic (Oberon, 1780) see Bartels 204; for Wieland's followers, Bartels 215 ff. For other attempts at epical poetry see the three volumes of M. Mendheim's Lyriker und Epiker der klassischen Periode (in Kürschner's Deutsche National-Litteratur). Recent essays in epic are Heinrich Hart's Lied der Menschheit (vols. 1–3, 1888–96) and Marie delle Grazie's Robespierre (1894).

XII. **The Dutch Epic and Allied Forms.**

For bibliography see § 6, XIV; also, in general, Paul's Grundriss.

With one or two exceptions the Dutch epic has attained neither importance nor grace; it has commonly been diverted from the heroic into didactic, descriptive, and mechanically scriptural channels. During the 13th century Middle Dutch versions of the Charlemagne cycle, of Arthurian legends, and of the Reynard the Fox were made by minstrels. The most important writer of the middle of that century was the didactic poet Jakob van Maerlant, who in his earlier years had occupied himself with the romances of Merlin and the Holy Grail. Somewhat later Hein van Aken finished a translation of the Roman de la Rose. — In the 14th century the epic assumed form in a poem of Jan van Heelu on the battle of Woeronc; and the original romance, in his War of Grimbergen and in Hein van Aken's Heinric en Margriete. — Beside the erotic and quasi-didactic poem of Dirk Potter, Der Minnen Loep, epic only in length (15th century), nothing at all resembling the epic appeared before the publication of The Palace of Maidens, a diffuse didactic poem by Houwaert, the 'Homer of Brabant,' — about the middle of the 16th century;

but translations of the Iliad and Aeneid were meanwhile making. About the end of the century the humanist, H. L. Spieghel, produced a didactic epic of greater popularity, Hertspieghel. — During the earlier part of the 17th century the dramatist Vondel busied himself with adaptations of Du Bartas' La Sepmaine ou Création du Monde, and the famous daughters of Roemer Visscher, Anna and Tesselschade, produced — the one, a didactic poem in praise of the river Amstel; the other, a translation of the Gerusalemme Liberata. About the middle of the century Reyer Anslo wrote a descriptive epic, The Plague at Naples; and during the latter third J. A. van der Goes undertook an epic of St. Paul, which he did not live to finish. — Under the influence of Voltaire and the French classical school poetry sank in the Holland of the early 18th century to a low level. Especially Voltairian were the labors in epic style of Sybrand Feitama and of Willem van Haren (in his historical poem Gevallen van Friso, 1741). The nadir appears to have been reached in what Gosse characterizes as "a terrible biblical epic" by Arnold Hoogvliet, "in the manner of Blackmore, on the history of Abraham." But toward the end of the century the more artistic qualities of the Augustan style found expression in the well-constructed epic of Elias by Willem Bilderdijk (1786). A similar excellence marks his uncompleted epic of The Destruction of the First World, published early in the succeeding century. — Also of the first decades of the 19th century were the didactic epic, entitled Antiquity, by Rhijnvis Feith, and the historical national poems of Cornelis Loots and J. F. Helmers, all of which display the sentimentalism of the romantic reaction. The riper qualities of romanticism entered Dutch poetry of the epic kind with the next generation, in the historical lyrics and the ballads of Hendrik Tollens and in the ballads and romances of Adrianus Bogaers. — For a more extended account, see E. W. Gosse's Studies in the Literature of Northern Europe (Lond.: 1879), containing essays on certain Norwegian, Swedish, Danish, German, and Dutch poets, and his articles in the Encyc. Brit. upon Dutch literature and Dutch writers.

XIII. Icelandic and Norse Epical Literature.

For bibliography, see J. Jónsson, Borgfirdingur, Söguágrip um prentsmidjur og prenatara á Islandi (Reykjavik: 1867); H. Einarsson, Historia Literaria Islandica, etc. (Havniae et Lipsiae: 1786); T. Moebius, Catalogus Librorum Islandicorum, etc. (Lipsiae: 1856); by the same, Verzeichnis der auf dem Gebiete der altnordischen . . . Sprache und Literatur von 1855 bis 1879 erschienenen Schriften (Leipz.: 1880); works which have appeared since 1879 are listed in the *Bibliographie des Ark. f. nord. Fil.* (1883+) and in the *Jahresbericht über d. Erschein. auf d. Geb. d. germ. Philol.* (1880+). The Bibliographischer Anhang to F. W. Horn's Gesch. d. Lit. d. skand. Nordens (Leipz.: 1880) is very useful; for the English translation of this work, see above, § 6, xv. A small and convenient bibliography, including articles in English magazines, will be found at the end of H. H. Sparling's edition of the Volsunga Saga (Camelot Series; trans.) or in Paul's Grundriss (2d ed., 2: 1, 555 ff., at the heads of sections and in the notes). For general histories see Appendix. A brief introduction is furnished in the admirable little volume by W. A. Craigie, The Icelandic Sagas (Camb. Man. of Sc. and Lit.). Mogk's article in Paul's Grundriss (noted below) is standard and authoritative and contains excellent bibliographical notes.

Norse and Icelandic prose and verse present many interesting problems and much valuable material to the student of epic development. The epical songs and lays of the Poetic Edda are representative of early stages of growth toward epic fruition, and the nature of their narrative technique casts light on the typical stages of popular treatment. Especially significant is the closeness of relation between narrative and lyric treatment as exemplified in many of the poems. The student may well undertake to compare the technique with that of the ballad and other forms presumably anterior, in point of development, to the long epic poem. The skaldic poems and the prose tales offer further problems. The student must inquire into their literary provenience so far as it can be investigated and surmised; he must determine to what stages of development in other literatures the sagas of romanticized history are analogous; he must note the distribution of the themes among the Germanic peoples and account for the processes and nature of this distribution; he must consider the methods of authorship, oral tradition, and popular publication, — all as indicative of laws of literary development; he must study, as further indications of such laws, the archaeology of the poems and sagas — the conditions antecedent and contemporaneous (religious, social, national, political) — and this study must be comparative, with reference to the archaeology of other epical literatures. These are only some of the problems that have engaged, and will continue to engage, the attention of students of the northern literatures. In many of the general histories treating of these literatures the student will be disappointed to find that comparative study is limited to a pleasing and superficial appraisement of the style and handling of the poems by regarding them in juxtaposition with similar poems in other literatures. The conclusions are of the sort that any discursive reader of average intelligence can undertake to evolve from his impressions. In dealing with the problems suggested Professor Ker's various works and essays will be found of particular value; the charge of impressionism and superficiality does not apply to his method, nor to that followed in the admirable publications of Vigfusson and Powell. Systematic and detailed investigation is furnished by Bugge also, and by Mogk, F. Jónsson, and others, for whom consult Paul's Grundriss.

Editions and Translations. *Editions:* (1) Of the Older or Poetic Edda (Edda Saemundar): Rask (Stockholm: 1818); Munch (Christ.: 1847); Lüning (Zürich: 1859); Moebius (Leipz.: 1860); S. Bugge, the best (1867); Grundtvig (2d ed. Copenh.: 1874); Hildebrand (Paderborn: 1875); G. Vigfusson and F. Y. Powell, best for the English student (Corpus Poeticum Boreale. 2 vols. Oxford: 1883); Detter und Heinzel (2 vols. Leipz.: 1903). (2) Of the skaldic poems: F. Jónsson, Den norsk-islandske Skjaldedigtning, etc. (2 vols. Copenh.: 1908–12); Vigfusson and Powell, vol. II; other references in Paul's Grundriss (2d ed., 2: 1, 656 ff.). (3) Of the historical and romantic sagas: see Paul's Grundriss, 730 ff., and the notes under each saga. (4) Of the so-called Younger or Prose Edda (Snorri Sturluson): Editio Arna-Mag. (3 vols. 1848–87), the best; T. Jónsson (1875); F. Jónsson (1907), being vol. XLI of the Íslendinga Sögur published at Reykjavik; further in Paul, 906 ff. — *Translations:* (1) Of the Poetic Edda: English versions by A. S. Cottle (Bristol: 1797); B. Thorpe (2 vols. Lond.:

1866); Vigfusson and Powell, Corpus Poeticum, etc. (1883); and see Gray, Herbert, Cottle, Aytoun, etc., for translations of brief poems. Eirikr Magnusson and William Morris drew their Story of the Volsungs and the Niblungs (Lond.: 1870) from the Poetic Edda. French versions by Mallet (Copenh.: 1755), only a partial translation, for the merit and influence of which see Vigfusson and Powell, Corp. Poet., vol. I, p. xcv; F. W. Bergmann (Paris: 1838); Anon. (1842); W. E. Frye (1844). German versions by the Grimm brothers (Berlin: 1815); F. W. Bergmann (Strassburg: 1879); K. Simrock (8th ed. Bonn: 1886); A. Holtzmann (Leipz.: 1875); B. Wenzel (2d ed. Leipz.: 1883); W. Jordan (Frankf.: 1889); H. Gering (Leipz.: 1892), the best. (2) Of the skaldic poems: Vigfusson and Powell. (3) Of the Prose Edda: incomplete English versions by I. A. Blackwell (in Mallet's Northern Antiquities. Bohn's Lib. Lond.: 1847); G. W. Dasent (Stockholm: 1842); R. B. Anderson (Chicago: 1880); A. G. Brodeur (N. Y.: 1916), — the most complete, with an admirable brief introduction. — For other translations of the Eddas see the Brit. Museum Cat., *sub* Eddas.

An extensive collection of English translations of northern literature, embracing popular tales, the Eddas, Heimskringla, Volsunga Saga, etc., etc., is published as Norroena (15 vols. Lond., etc.: 1906); see vols. VI–VIII for an account of Teutonic myth and saga, a translation by R. B. Anderson of V. Rydberg's Teutonic Mythology. Convenient lists of English translations of the prose sagas may be found in Craigie (*op. cit.* Chap. VII) and Sparling (cited at the head of this division). In Everyman's Library are translations of the Burnt Njal, Grettir, and Heimskringla; in the Temple Classics, a version of the Laxdaela. For an elementary sketch of the mythology, see Gayley's Classic Myths (rev. ed. Boston: 1911), pp. 373–409, and for the literature, pp. 457–460, 534–536.

References. The following list may serve to start the student along the path of previous scholarship: S. Bugge, Helgi-Digtene i den aeldere Edda (Copenh.: 1896. English trans. by Schofield, The Home of the Eddic Poems. Lond.: 1899); by the same, Studien über die Entstehung der nordischen Götter- und Heldensagen (München: 1881–89. The German trans. is by Brenner); Sir G. W. Dasent, The Story of the Burnt Njal, etc. (Edinb.: 1861); Winifred Faraday, The Edda (Lond.: 1902); E. W. Gosse, Art. The Edda (in the 9th ed. of the Encyc. Brit.); J. L. C. Grimm, Teutonic Mythology (Lond.: 1880); F. W. Horn, Gesch. d. Lit. d. skand. Nordens, pp. 11–81; F. Jónsson, Den oldnorske og oldislandske Litteraturs Historie (3 vols. Copenh.: 1894–1902), — most complete and authoritative, for an abridgment of which see Jónsson's Den islandske Litteraturs Historie (1907); W. P. Ker, Epic and Romance (2d ed. Lond.: 1908); by the same, The Dark Ages (Periods of European Lit. N.Y.: 1904. See pp. 267–307); E. de Laveleye (see above, § 11); C. M. Lotspeich, The Composition of the Icelandic Family Sagas (in *Jr. Eng. and Germ. Phil.*, 8: 217. 1909); P. H. Mallet, Northern Antiquities (Bohn's Lib. Lond.: 1847. Trans. by Bishop Percy. Rev. by I. A. Blackwell. Percy's trans. appeared originally in 2 vols., in 1770; Mallet's work, in the original French, appeared in 1756), one of the early, and the most famous of the early, antiquarian treatises on the northern peoples and literatures; E. Magnusson and W. Morris, Three Northern Love-Stories, etc. (Lond.: 1875); by the same, The Story of Grettir the Strong (Lond.: 1869); by the same, The Story of the Volsungs and the Niblungs, etc. (Lond.: 1870), — these translations and adaptations did much to popularize the interest in the northern literatures; E. Mogk, Norwegisch-isländische Lit. (in Paul's Grundriss); Bishop T. Percy, Five Pieces of Runic Poetry, etc. (Lond.: 1763); G. Saintsbury, The Flourishing of Romance, Chap. VIII (Periods of European Lit. N.Y.: 1897), — the treatment of the sagas is disappointing to the student; G. Vigfusson, Prolegomena to his ed. of the Sturlunga Saga (2 vols. Oxford: 1878); G. Vigfusson and F. Y. Powell, Corpus Poeticum Boreale (2 vols. Oxford: 1883); by the same, Origines Islandicae (2 vols. Oxford: 1905), — works that contain texts, translations, textual notes, valuable historical and analytic material, etc. The student should begin with Vigfusson and Powell, and he will probably find at the end of his study that he still is dependent most upon their contribution to the subject.

XIV. **Modern Scandinavian Epic, Metrical Romance, etc.**

For a preliminary outline of Swedish, Danish, and Norwegian poetry, and for references, see above, § 6, XVII, XVIII. It will suffice here merely to mention the more important poems of the epical type produced from the year 1200 down.

A. *In Sweden.* In the 13th, 14th, and 15th centuries, folk songs and rhyming romances of the medieval French, German, and Breton material; the rhyming Erikskronikan, or chronicle of the Duke Eric, about 1320; the chronicles of King Karl Knutson, etc.; the translation of the Latin romance of chivalry, King Alexander (about the end of the 14th century); and the famous Song of Engelbrekt, the national hero, by Bishop Tomas, in the

15th. — In 1653, the epic-didactic poem in hexameters, Hercules, by the humanist Stjernhjelm, — an allegory of the strife of Virtue and Pleasure, written with imagination and grace. In 1685, by Spegel, a heavy religious epic, God's Work and Rest, — a free translation of the Hexaëmeron of the Danish poet Arrebo. About 1697, the patriotic and genuinely poetic Kunga-skald, of Dahlstjerna, in honor of his patron, Charles XI. — In the 18th century, under the influence of the pseudo-classical movement, Dalin's highly lauded allegorical epic, Svenska Friheten — Swedish Freedom (1742), "a political brochure in rhetorical alexandrines" but conceived and written with taste; and, in 1785, G. F. Gyllenborg's allegorical and affected heroic poem, The Expedition across the Belt, which celebrated Charles X's journey over the ice from Jutland to Zealand. — The didactic idyl, Emily or an Evening in Lapland, and the epic poems of Franzén — Sven Sture, Columbus, and Gustaf Adolf — occupy in the beginning of the 19th century a halfway position between the tendencies of the idealistic romantic Phosphorists and those of the poets of the Gothic revival. Little of epic quality was produced by the Phosphorists, — the Markall's Sleepless Nights of their leader Atterbom, in conjunction with Hammarsköld and others, being merely a satirical heroic poem. Sympathetic, but not allied, with the Phosphorists was Stagnelius, whose epic, Vladimir the Great (1817), and unfinished metrical romances are characterized by phantasy and vivid descriptive power. Of the Gothic school more than one contributed to epic poetry: Ling, for instance, inherently a lyrist, by his lyric-epic, Tirfing, and by his epics of Norse gods and heroes, the Gylfe and the Asarne — both of which, however, lack constructive power in characterization and form; and supremely, Tegnér, whose romantic heroic cycle, Frithiofs-saga (1820–25), though frankly indebted to the Helge of the Danish Oehlenschläger, is the most forceful, the noblest, and most distinctively national of Swedish epics — a masterpiece with continental influence. His Gerda and Kronbruden are incomplete, but must be studied for their creative power and poetic crystallization of the Scandinavian spirit and tradition. During the first half of the century two epics of brilliant style — Arturs Jagt and Shems-el-Nihar — were produced by that mysterious and malign genius of romantic irresponsibility, K. J. L. Almqvist, better known for his novels. Between 1831 and 1860 appeared also the idyllic and heroic poems of the last great poet of Sweden, the Finnish-born Runeberg. His epical lyric romances, — The Grave in Perrho, and Nadeschda (of Russian life), — his Ossianic cycle, Kung Fjalar, his idyls of epic movement and breadth, — The Elk-hunters, Hanna, Christmas Eve, — and his masterpiece, the wonderfully realistic and patriotic series of historical verse-romances of heroism, The Tales of Ensign Stål, are all of consequence in the history of epic poetry.

B. *Danish-Norwegian.* Up to the 16th century, the Kjaempeviser, or ballads, — mythical, heroic, chivalric, historical, — and rhyming chronicles as in Sweden. See Axel Olrik, Danmarks Heltedigtning (3 vols. Copenh.: 1907+). In 1641, the Hexaëmeron of Bishop Arrebo, who had died four years before (cf. § 6, XVIII, A, above). In 1719–20, Holberg's remarkable burlesque of heroic poems, ancient and modern, Peder Paars of Kallundborg; and in 1741, his verse-romance of the sexton Niels Klim's Journey to the Lower World, satirizing European conditions in general, — written in Latin and translated into nearly all European languages (into Danish by Baggesen). A comparison of Peder Paars with Boileau's Lutrin and of Niels Klim with Swift's Gulliver at once suggests itself. — Of the Norwegian poets of the latter part of the century, Edvard Storm (1749–1794) deserves attention for the spirit of native hero-song pervading his romantic poems, Zinklar and Thorvald Vidförle; and the brothers Frimann, for similar qualities in folk song and metrical romance; C. H. Pram (1756–1821), also, for a serious epic, the first of its kind in Denmark, entitled Staerkodder — greatly admired in its day. The most distinguished literary artist of the end of the century, Baggesen, contributed nothing to epic poetry, — his Comical Tales and his descriptive Labyrinth fall under other heads. To his younger contemporary and rival, Oehlenschläger, however, Denmark is indebted for her greatest epics and verse-romances: of the latter kind the magnificent cycle, Helge (1814); of the former the stately epic cycle, The Gods of the North (1819), based upon the Eddas, and the epic poems Hrolf Krake (1829) and Regnar Lodbrog (1848). Under a like inspiration of Scandinavian antiquity Grundtvig produced between 1812 and 1817 historical poems, the best of which are the Rhyme of Roskilde and the Saga of Roskilde. At the same time Ingemann, in addition to his historical romances, was writing poems of popular heroic character. Other writers of the 19th century whose poems savor of epical intent and style may readily be traced in the histories of literature. Suffice it to mention the most distinguished, Paludan-Müller, whose lyrical epics, The Danseuse, Amor and Psyche, Adonis, are of ethical moment or satirical intent, and whose mock-heroic Adam Homo is a profound religious and psychological study of the pitiable weaknesses of mankind. Placing such modern developments as these of Paludan-Müller side by side with the numerous efforts that have been made at the epical treatment of Christian mythology, the student may profitably inquire whether in the future the miraculous element may not be discarded without detriment to the vitality of the poetic type.

In Norway as distinct from Denmark — that is, since 1814 — the attempts at epic poetry have been but few: Wergeland's poem, lyric-dramatic in quality and epical in magnitude, Creation, Man, and Messiah (1830); the romantic cycle, The Wedding-Journey of the King's Daughter, by Munch (1861); the epic narrative, Storegut (the Big Lad), by Vinje (1866), in the selectively formed written language of the Landsmaal; and Björnstjerne Björnson's cyclic poem, Arnljot Gelline.

XV. **The Finnish Epic.**

Elias Lönnrot first published his collection of old Finnish ballads in a connected form of his own, under the title Kalevala, in 1835 (2 vols.). In 1849 he published an enlarged edition; in 1887 a still more complete text was published by A. V. Forsman. — English translations have been made by J. M. Crawford (2 vols. N. Y.: 1888) and W. F. Kirby (in Everyman's Lib. Lond.: 1907); J. Baldwin, The Sampo, Hero Adventures from the Kalevala (N. Y.: 1912). L. le Duc has published a French version under the title of La Finlande (2 vols. Paris: 1845); as has also C. E. de Ujfalvy de Mezö-Kövesd (Paris: 1876). For a German translation, see F. A. von Schiefner, Kalewala, das National-Epos der Finnen, etc. (Helsingfors: 1852). There is a Swedish translation by Castren (1841).

The Kalevala is one of the most important documents for the historical study of the epic. Its significance is noted under the reference to Comparetti given above (§ 11).

In addition to Comparetti the following authorities should be consulted: C. J. Billson, Folk Songs in the Kalevala (in *Folk Lore*, 6: 317–352. 1895); F. C. Cook, Kalevala (in *Contemp. Rev.*, 47: 683–702. 1885); Crawford, Preface to the translation noted above; J. Grimm, Über das finnische Epos (in Kleinere Schriften. 8 vols. Berlin: 1864–90. See vol. II, pp. 75–113; the date of the essay is 1845); A. Lang, Homer and the Epic (see above, § 11); by the same, Introduction to Comparetti's Kalevala (see above, § 11); by the same, Custom and Myth, pp. 156–179 (1885); J. Krohn (see above, § 11); J. A. Porter, Introd. to his Selections from the Kalevala (1868); W. J. A. Freiherr von Tettau, Über die epischen Dichtungen der finnischen Völker (Erfurt: 1873). See also A. Launis, Über Art, Entstehung und Verbreitung der ethnisch-finnischen Runen-Melodien (Helsingfors: 1910).

XVI. Russian, Polish, and Other Epical Materials.

"Russia presents the phenomenon of a country where epic song, handed down wholly by oral tradition for nearly a thousand years, is not only flourishing at the present day in certain districts, but even extending into fresh fields." For an account of the collections of these songs made by Peter Rýbnikof (1861–62) and A. F. Hilferding, see the introduction to Hapgood's Epic Songs of Russia. The study of Russian epic literature (bardic poems, folk epic) may begin with A. Rambaud's La Russe épique (see above, § 11). The literary histories of Brückner, Hapgood, Morfill, von Reinholdt, Talvi, Waliszewski should be consulted (see Appendix). In Brückner's work see pp. 8–10, 233 Heroic Age, the sagas or *Bylíny*; 12–13 Igor's Raid; 173–174 Zhukóvskiy's spirited translation of the Odyssey; 178 ff. Pushkin. One of the best works for consultation is L. Wiener's Anthology of Russian Literature (2 vols. N.Y.: 1902), which contains bibliography, historical outlines of the literature, and trustworthy translations.

The following works deal specifically with the epic: W. Bistrom, Das russische Volksepos (in *Ztschr. für Völkerpsychol.*, 5: 180 ff., 6: 132 ff.; cf. above, § 11), an important essay; I. F. Hapgood, Epic Songs of Russia (N.Y.: 1886), which contains an introduction, and translations such as The Word of Igor's Troop, The Lays of the Elder Heroes, the Cycles of Vladimir and Novgorod; V. Jagić, Die christlich-mythol. Schicht in d. russ. Volksepik (in *Archiv für slav. Philol.*, vol. I, 1876); L. A. Magnus, The Tale of the Armament of Igor, — edited, translated, etc., with introd. (Oxford Press: 1915); F. Miklosich, Beiträge zur Kenntniss der slav. Volkspoesie (Wien: 1870); by the same, Die Darstellung im slav. Volksepos (Wien: 1890); W. R. S. Ralston, Songs of the Russian People, etc. (Lond.: 1872), which is devoted more to lyric than to epic poems; by the same, Russian Folk-Tales (Lond.: 1873), — not of great direct value; W. Wollner, Untersuch. über die Volksepik der Grossrussen (Leipz.: 1879). For works in Russian, see bibliography in Waliszewski, Wiener, etc.

For Serbian ballads and other folk poetry, see Karájich, Pópovich, Noyes and Bacon, etc., as mentioned in § 6, XXI, above; A. Soerensen, noted above, § 11; V. Jagić, Die südslavische Volksepik (in *Archiv für slavische Philologie*, 4: 192–242); A. Dozon, L'épopée serbe, etc. (Paris: 1888); L. A. Frankl, Gusle, serbische Nationallieder (Wien: 1852); J. Wiles, Serbian Songs and Poems, etc. (Lond.: 1917); L. Leger, Le cycle épique de Marko Kralievitch (Paris: 1906), — slight. The *Bohemian* epic material is of the metrical-romance order: see the Alexandreis, which is an adaptation of a Latin poem by Gaultier de Chatillon. References on Bohemian literature may be found in § 6, XXI, above, and below in the Appendix. See also L. Leger, Chants héroiques . . . des Slaves de Bohême. On the *Hungarian*, the same sections. The *Polish* epics of Adam Mickiewicz should receive notice. His Thaddeus (Pan Tadeusz) and his Konrad Wallenrod may be found in English translations by Miss Biggs (1881–85), and in French versions in the Œuvres poétiques de Mickiewicz, by C. Ostrowski (Paris: 1845); see also M. M. Gardner, Adam Mickiewicz, the National Poet of Poland (Lond.: 1911); L. Mickiewicz, Vie d'Adam Mickiewicz (4 vols. Posen: 1890–95); by the same, A. M., sa vie et son œuvre (Paris: 1888). For other poetry of epic material see Morfill, Bowring, Soboleski, etc. (§ 6, XXI, above).

XVII. **Persian Epics.**

For bibliography see the notes to T. Nöldeke's Das iranische Nationalepos (in vol. II, pp. 130–211, of the Grundriss der iranischen Philologie. Ed. by W. Geiger and E. Kuhn. 2 vols. Strassburg: 1895–1904). Nöldeke's article, which is the best upon the subject, is also obtainable in separate form (same title, Strassburg: 1896). On pp. 134–135 of the Grundriss, Nöldeke writes, in connection with the growth of the Persian epic: "Wir haben hier, wenn nicht alles täuscht, die Erscheinung, welche sich bei epischen Gedichten verschiedner Völker zeigt: der Stoff ist allgemein bekannt; einzelne Stücke werden daraus kunstmässig bearbeitet; aus solchem Material kann später durch Zusammenpassen, Ausgleichen, Weglassen und Umformen ein mehr oder weniger in sich geschlossenes Gesamtepos entstehen." Consult also the note on this passage. Bibliographical material will also be found in the works of E. G. Browne and Pizzi, cited in the Appendix.

The Shāhnāma of Firdawsī "represents the National Legend in its final form." Begun by Daqīqī for the Sāmānid Prince Nuḥ b. Manṣur (A.D. 976–997), it was completed by Firdawsī (the "man of Paradise," Abu'l Kāsim Mansur, *c.* 940–1020) in about sixty thousand couplets. The poem is a compilation of the deeds of a long line of legendary and historical kings (*Shāhnāma* means Book of Kings), based upon previous poems, which in turn were based upon a series of still earlier versions of ancient myths and legends. The scheme of such a work is obviously more historical than epical, suggesting the Hebrew books of I and II Samuel and I and II Kings. The Shāhnāma really contains the subjects of many epics, — such as the stories of Jamshīd, Narīman, Sām, Zāl, Rustam, and Suhrāb. Rustam's deeds are told at length, and, except for the biographical scope of the story, might be regarded as an epic within the Shāhnāma.

An abridged *translation* into English was published by James Atkinson in 1832, in London (The Sháh Námeh, etc. In Pubs. of the Oriental Translation Fund of Great Britain and Ireland); a recent version by A. G. and E. Warner is suitable for the use of the student (2 vols. Lond.: 1906), as is also the version of A. Rogers (1907), which is fairly complete. Compare the paraphrase by Helen Zimmern, Epic of Kings, Stories retold from Firdusi (Lond.: 1882), which contains an excellent introduction.

There is a French translation by Julius von Mohl (with text and commentary, 7 vols. Paris: 1838–78; without text, 7 vols. Paris: 1876–78). The German translation of F. Rückert has been edited by Bayer (3 vols. Berlin: 1890–95). A. F. von Schack's Heldensagen des Firdusi, etc. (Stuttgart: 1877), is an abridgment, with an introduction. There is also a summary of the poem, in romantic style, by J. Görres (Das Heldenbuch von Iran. 2 vols. Berlin: 1820). I. Pizzi has made a complete translation into Italian verse (Firdusi, etc. 8 vols. Torino: 1886–88), which is particularly valuable for the use of the student.

In imitation of the Shāhnāma epics on various heroes were composed, for which see p. 112 of P. Horn's work (cited in the Appendix), and pp. 209, 233 ff., of the 2d vol. of the Grundriss der iran. Philol. Firdawsī himself composed another epic, — religious, based on the story of Joseph in the Koran, — for which see Horn, pp. 108–112, and the Grundriss, vol. II, pp. 229–231. The title of this epic is Yūsuf and Zuleikha. There is a German translation by Schlechta-Wssehrd (Jussuf und Suleicha, romantisches Heldengedicht von Firdusi. Wien: 1889).

The student should also examine the later romantic poetry, in which a more artificial, artistic, and lyrical manner predominates. He will find interest in comparing these romantic epics with those of the Italian Renaissance and with the Kāvya of India (see below, XVIII, C). The chief poet of this romantic school was Nizāmī (1141–1203.) For the entire movement, and German translations of many of the poems, see Horn, pp. 177–193, and the Grundriss, vol. II, p. 239 ff., where extended bibliography is cited (for Nizāmī, p. 243).

References. The following works treat of the Persian epic as a whole or of particular periods or poems: E. G. Browne (for work, see Appendix), vol. I, pp. 110–123, and Chap. IV; J. Darmesteter, Études iraniennes, vol. II (2 vols. Paris: 1883); by the same, Les origines de la poésie persane (Paris: 1887); Encyc. Brit., Arts. on Persian Lit. and Firdousi; an enlarged edition of Nöldeke's contribution to the 9th ed. of the Encyc. Brit. (Ancient Hist. of Persia), which appeared at Leipzig, 1887, as Aufsätze zur persischen Geschichte; H. Ethé, Die höfische und romantische Poesie der Perser (Hamburg: 1887), — very valuable in connection with the court and romantic epics of Italy, France, Germany, etc.; K. Geldner (in Hinneberg's Kultur der Gegenwart, I, vii); Gubernatis (as cited above, § 5); P. Horn, p. 81 ff. of the work cited in the Appendix; S. Johnson, Oriental Religion, Persia, pp. 711–782 (1885); Sir John Malcolm, Hist. of Persia, etc. (2 vols. Lond.: 1815), which, together with C. Markham's Gen. Sketch of the Hist. of Persia (Lond.: 1874), constitutes the chief material of historical reference in English — untrustworthy, however, in statement of fact and obsolete in method; T. Nöldeke, Persische Studien II (in Sitzungsber. der Kais. Akad. der Wissensch. in Wien, Philos.-hist. Classe, Bd. 126, 1892); I. Pizzi, Della epopea persiana (Torino: 1886); also L'epopea persiana (Firenze: 1888); also Storia della poesia persiana (see Appendix); E. A. Reed (see Appendix); Sainte-Beuve, The Poet Firdousi, — the chat of Feb. 11, 1850, in Causeries du Lundi (trans. by E. J. Trechmann. 7 vols. Lond.: n.d. New Universal Lib. See vol. I, pp. 266–280); F. Spiegel, Erânische Alterthumskunde (3 vols. Leipz.: 1871–78), — important for the historical and religious aspects of Persian life (cf. M. Duncker's Geschichte des Alterthums, E. Meyer's Gesch. des Alterthums, and other standard works of like scope). — For references on Persian prosody, see above, § 6, XXVI.

XVIII. **The Indian Epic.**

A. *Mahābhārata and Rāmāyana.*

For bibliography see the bibliographies, histories, and journals of Indian literature cited in the Appendix.

The Mahabharata, with its anonymity and inordinate length, with its kernel of narrative drawn from original lays, its later strata of didactic material, its constant self-contradiction and resulting confusion, offers an ideal example of the processes of growth of the popular epic. The Ramayana is an illustration of the first and more virile form of the artificial epic, — subjected to self-conscious rules, but palpitant with an early heroism. The later artificial epics (see below) show the loss of the heroic spirit and imagination, and the substitution of fanciful subjects and clever variations of diction. The development of erotic themes in these later epics is of particular interest as showing a characteristic weakening of the old heroic strain.

For the English student the best introduction to the two poems is The Great Epic of India, its Character and Origin, by E. W. Hopkins (N.Y.: 1901). In another work by the same author (India Old and New. N.Y.: 1901) the present knowledge of the origin and growth of the two epics is briefly summarized as follows:

> Various considerations show that while the Mahabharata as a completed whole is later than the Ramayana, in origin it is older. . . . It is impossible to assign exact dates to either epic, but while the lays on which the Mahabharata was based probably revert to a much older period, in its present shape the narrative part cannot be older than the second or third century B.C., and its didactic masses are still later. Apart from the didactic fungus that has grown upon it, the great epic is derived both from lays and dramatic legends (recitations), worked together by various revisers. It has no one author. The Ramayana, on the other hand, is the work of a poet familiar with the older epic style, which he improves upon, for Valmiki was the first writer of what used to be called elegant poetry. The Hindus call it artistic poetry, Kavya, in distinction from the rougher epic, which is simply Akhyana or Tale (Essay on Sanskrit Epic Poetry, pp. 70–71).

Translations. (*a*) *Of the Mahabharata:* The entire poem in English prose, published at the expense of Protap Chandra Roy in ten large volumes (Calcutta: 1883–96); Sir E. Arnold's translations of fragments of the poem (1881 and 1883); a convenient literal translation by M. N. Dutt (5 vols. Calcutta: 1896), condensed into verse by Romesh Dutt (Temple Classics Series). The Episode of Nala has been translated by H. H. Milman (Nala and Damayanti and Other Poems, 1834) and edited by Sir Monier-Williams (2d ed. Oxford: 1879; 1st ed., 1876). Other portions of the epic have been translated by John Muir (Metrical Translations from Sanskrit Writers, 1879), David Price (Last Days of Krishna, Oriental Trans. Fund: Miscell. Trans.), H. H. Wilson (in *Asiatic Researches*, vol. 15), A. W. Ryder (in *Univ. Cal. Chronicle*, vol. XV, 1 Drona's Death; vol. XV, 3 Simple Deer-Horn; vol. XVIII, 3 Manu and the Fish). Other episodes have appeared in *Internat. Rev.*, 10: 36, 297; *Oriental Mag.*, Dec. 1824, March, Sept. 1825, Sept. 1826; *Scribner's Mag.*, 7: 385. For versions in French, see E. Pavie (Paris: 1844), fragmentary; A. Sadous (Versailles: 1858), fragmentary; P. É. Foucaux, Le Mahabharata, onze épisodes, etc. (Paris: 1862); and H. Fauche (10 vols. Paris: 1863–70), in part only. The German versions are of parts of the poem only; see F. Bopp (Berlin: 1829), A. Holtzmann (3 Thle. Karlsruhe: 1845–47), J. H. Becker (1888). For translations of particular parts of the epic, such as the Bhagavadgita, see the Catalogue of the British Museum, under Mahabharata. (*b*) *Of the Ramayana:* A brief paraphrase in English by F. Richardson, in his The Iliad of the East (Lond.: 1870); a free translation into English verse by Griffith (Benares: 1870+); and a prose version edited by M. N. Dutt (7 vols. Calcutta: 1889–1894). The abridged version by R. Dutt is in the Temple Classics Series. For other translations, in English and other languages, see the Catalogue of the British Museum, under Ramayana. Dutt's condensed versions both of the Mahabharata and Ramayana are published in one volume of Everyman's Library.

References. The student should consult the literary histories of India cited in the Appendix. The following works deal directly or indirectly with the epics; but since Sanskrit scholarship has of late advanced very rapidly, treatises published before 1890 must be read with caution: A. Baumgartner, Das Râmâyana und die Râma-Literatur der Inder, etc. (Freiburg i. B.: 1894); see the same author's Geschichte der Weltliteratur (cited in the Appendix); G. Bühler, Indian Studies, No. II (Sitzungsber. der phil.-hist. Classe der Kais. Akad. der Wissensch., Bd. 127. Wien: 1892); A. L. Chézy, Théorie du sloka ou mètre héroïque sanscrit (Paris: 1827. For other references on metre, see Gayley and Scott, pp. 515–516); R. N. Cust, Linguistic and Oriental Essays (7 vols. in 8. Lond.: 1880–1904. Vol. I, Chap. III Ramayana); J. Dahlmann, Genesis des Mahābhārata (Berlin: 1899. For a review of the work see *Wiener Zeitschr. für Kunde d. Morgenl.*, 14: 51 ff., by M. Winternitz, and in vol. 20 of the same periodical see articles on other subjects by Winternitz and by Franke, and in vol. 18 an article by Hertel on Der Ursprung des indischen Dramas und Epos); J. Dahlmann, Das Mahābhārata als Epos und Rechtsbuch (Berlin: 1895); F. G. Eichhoff, Poésie héroïque des Indiens comparée à l'épopée grecque et romaine, etc. (Paris: 1860; Lyon: 1853); V. Henry, Les littératures de l'Inde (Paris: 1904), light and sketchy; A. Holtzmann, Das Mahābhārata (4 vols. Kiel: 1892–95), an important work; E. W. Hopkins, articles on the origin and historical value of the epics and on epic chronology (in *Journ. of the Amer. Oriental Soc.*, 23: 350 ff., 24: 7 ff.); by the same, The Religions of India (Boston: 1895), with which use Barth, Religions of India (Eng. trans. Lond.: 1882); H. Jacobi, Das Rāmāyana, Geschichte und Inhalt, etc. (Bonn: 1893), important; by the same, an article in the *Göttinger Gelehrte Anzeigen*, 8: 659 ff.; by the same, on the Ramayana, in the *Zeitschr. d. deut.*

morgenl. Gesellschaft, 48: 407 ff.; A. Ludwig, Über das Rāmāyaṇa (Prag: 1894); A. A. Macdonell, as cited in the Appendix (pp. 281–302 Mahābhārata; pp. 302–317 Rāmāyana); J. C. Oman, Struggles in the Dawn, etc. (Lahore: 1893); by the same, The Great Indian Epics, etc. (Bohn's Lib. Lond.: 1894); R. Pischel, Die indische Lit. (in Hinneberg's Kultur der Gegenwart, I, vii); H. M. Posnett, Comparative Literature, pp. 304–309 (cf. above, § 11); F. Schlegel, Lects. on the Hist. of Lit. (English trans., in Bohn's Lib. Lond.: 1876. Lect. V); cf., by the same author, an essay On the Lang. and Philosophy of the Indians (trans. by E. J. Millington, in Bohn's Lib. Lond.: 1849. First German ed., 1808), which marks the beginning of Sanskrit scholarship among the Germans; Sir Monier-Williams, Indian Epic Poetry (Lond.: 1863), now antiquated; by the same, Indian Wisdom (Lond.: 1875), also antiquated, but both works are still important; also antiquated for the most part, H. H. Wilson, various works, to be found in any good Sanskrit catalogue.

B. *The Puranas.* The eighteen Puranas are compilations of ancient legends and myths and rules of worship, closely related in subject-matter to the Mahabharata. Their origin and the exact nature of their relation to the epic are problematical.

On the Puranas see, as noted above, Holtzmann, vol. IV, pp. 29–58; V. Henry, Chap. III; and Macdonell, pp. 299–302, and 445, where bibliography of translations will be found.

C. *Later Epic Literature.* An artificial epic court poetry, called *Kāvya* (see above), was developed in India from about the third century B.C. to the twelfth century after Christ (on the Kavya Age, see Macdonell, p. 318 ff.). A beginning of the artificial epic had been made with the Ramayana, as already noted; the unified, artistically handled theme of Valmiki is in striking contrast to the conglomerate and confused mass of the Mahabharata. The Kavyas, however, pushed artistic workmanship and artificial rules to the extreme. Both audiences and authors were interested in ingenuities of style and conceit, rather than in heroic matter. It was between the fifth and twelfth centuries after Christ that the more important of the Kavyas made their appearance, the best being those of Kālidāsa (probably of the fifth century). The growth of lyric and didactic elements in this court epic is of significance in the history of literary types, and should be compared with similar developments in French and German poetry.

A list of the minor Sanskrit epics will be found in Macdonell, Chap. XI, and pp. 446–447 (Bibliog. Note). Kālidāsa's Raghuvaṃça (The Story of Raghu's Line) was translated into Latin by A. F. Stenzler (Lond.: 1832); into English by P. de Lacy Johnstone (Lond.: 1902). R. T. H. Griffith has translated the first seven cantos of the same poet's Kumārasambhava under the English title The Birth of the War-God Kârtikeya (Lond.: 1853). Stenzler had published a Latin translation of it in 1838 (Lond.). See the general histories, and H. Jacobi, Die Epen Kâlidâsa's (in Verhand. d. 5. internat. Orientalisten-Kongresses, 1881, Sect. 2, pp. 133–156. Berlin: 1882).

XIX. **The Babylonian-Sumerian Epic.**

General literary and historical material will be found in the following: C. Bezold, Die babyl.-assyr. Lit. (in Hinneberg's Kultur der Gegenwart, I, vii); H. Gunkel, Schöpfung und Chaos (1895) and Die Schöpfungslegende (1904); E. Hommel, Geschichte Babyloniens und Assyriens (Berlin: 1885); M. Jastrow, The Religion of Babylonia and Assyria (Boston: 1898); A. Jeremias, Die babyl.-assyr. Vorstellungen vom Leben nach dem Tode (Leipz.: 1887); L. W. King, Babylonian Religion and Mythology (Lond.: 1900) and the Seven Tablets of Creation (2 vols. 1902); S. Langdon, Sumerian Epic of Paradise, the Flood and the Fall of Man (*Univ. of Penn., Univ. Museum, Pubs. of Babylonian Sec.* Philadelphia: 1915); C. P. Thiele, Babylonisch-assyrische Geschichte (Gotha: 1886–88); H. Winckler, Geschichte Babyloniens und Assyriens (Leipz.: 1892). — *Translations* of Babylonian and Assyrian lyric and narrative material will be found in most of the works just mentioned, and in the following: Records of the Past (11 vols. Lond.; 1873–78); P. Jensen, Assyrisch-babylonische Mythen und Epen (Berlin: 1900); J. A. Craig, Assyrian and Babylonian Religious Texts (2 vols. Leipz.: 1895–97; P. Jensen, Die Kosmologie der Babylonier (Strassburg: 1890). For further references see pp. 89–91 of the bibliography compiled by I. A. Pratt, cited below, in the Appendix.

A very convenient *résumé* of epic material will be found in O. Weber's Die Literatur der Babylonier und Assyrer, pp. 38–114 (in Der alte Orient, vol. II. Leipz.: 1907). The epic of Gilgamesh affords the most extended narrative, and much may be done in the way of comparing its features of style and construction with those of other ancient epics. For a translation and commentary see A. Ungnad und H. Gressmann, Das Gilgamesch-Epos (Göttingen: 1911). Weber gives all the necessary bibliography for this and other epical materials of the Babylonians. To his citation of works on Gilgamesh may be added the interesting study in the distribution and history of the story in Jensen's Das Gilgamesch-Epos in der Weltliteratur (vol. I. Strassburg: 1906).

XX. **Various Other Epics and Epical Material.**

A Brazilian epic, in Portuguese, is that of Gonzalve de Magalhães, entitled A Confederação dos Tamoyos (see Körting, Encyk., 1886, 3: 589). The Popul Vuh of the Quiché Indians of Guatemala contains cosmogonic, mythological, and historical material. It was translated by Father Ximenez in the eighteenth century. The epical material of the Malays may be noted in the work of R. Brandstetter, Charakterisierung der Epik der Malaien, etc. (Luzern: 1891); and Baumgartner's history refers to their narrative art on pp. 619–620 of the second volume. For a Javanese poem see A. B. Cohen Stuart, Brata-Joeda, Indisch-Javaansch Heldendicht (2 vols. Batavia: 1860). T. Braga's Epopêas da raça mosarabe (Porto: 1871) opens another little-known field. Little attention has been paid by students of comparative literature to Armenian epical literature (see Baumgartner, vol. I, p. 242 ff.). V. V. Radloff's Proben der Volkslit. der türkischen Stämme (5 pts. St. Petersburg: 1866–85) throws much light upon the development of folk legends. On Egyptian story-telling, see F. Petrie, Egyptian Tales, First and Second Series (1893–95); G. Maspero, Contes populaires de l'Égypte ancienne, trad. et commentés (4th ed. Paris: 1911), which includes bibliography; F. L. Griffith, Stories of the High Priests of Memphis (demotic stories).

XXI. **Folk Poetry and Fairy Tales.**

The narrative art of the folk tale and of the fairy tale may be studied in connection with the art of the early forerunners of the epic lay. The animal epic and fable offer another field of investigation; for list of authorities see under Foulet, § 11, above. For a long and very convenient list of works upon folk poetry, and of collections of folk poetry, see Paul's Grundriss der germ. Philol., 2d ed., 2: 1, 1135 ff. (Scandinavian 1135 ff.; German and Netherlandish 1178 ff.). Works pertaining to primitive folk verse are noted above, § 6, under XXXIII and also under the divisions devoted to the lyrics of various nationalities, and in this section under the preceding divisions.

APPENDIX

A BRIEF BIBLIOGRAPHY OF THE HISTORY OF POETRY

CONSPECTUS

- I. Bibliography of Bibliographies
- II. Encyclopedias
- III. Academic Dissertations
- IV. Literature in General
  - *A.* Bibliography
    - 1. Manuals
    - 2. Library Catalogues
      - (*a*) Author Catalogues
      - (*b*) Subject Catalogues
  - *B.* Histories
  - *C.* Periodicals
    - 1. Indexes
    - 2. Bibliographies
    - 3. List of Periodicals of International Scope
- V. Classical Poetry in General[1]
- VI. Greek Poetry
- VII. Pagan Greek Poetry of Alexandrian and Roman Periods
- VIII. Greek Christian Poetry to the Byzantine Period
- IX. Byzantine Poetry
- X. Roman Poetry
- XI. Latin Christian Poetry
- XII. Modern European Poetry and Comparative Literature
- XIII. French (including Provençal) Poetry
- XIV. Italian Poetry
- XV. Spanish (including Catalan) Poetry
- XV*a*. Spanish-American Poetry
- XVI. Portuguese Poetry
- XVII. English Poetry
- XVIII. American (United States) Poetry
- XIX. Celtic Poetry in General
- XX. Irish (including Irish-English) Poetry
- XXI. Scottish and Manx Poetry
- XXII. Welsh (including Welsh-English) Poetry
- XXIII. Cornish and Breton Poetry
- XXIV. German Poetry
- XXV. Dutch Poetry
- XXVI. Icelandic Poetry
- XXVII. Swedish Poetry
- XXVIII. Danish-Norwegian Poetry
- XXIX. Slavic Poetry in General
- XXX. Russian Poetry
- XXXI. Polish Poetry
- XXXII. Cheskian (Bohemian) Poetry
- XXXIII. Serbian and other South-Slavic Poetry
- XXXIV. Hungarian (Magyar) Poetry
- XXXV. Oriental Poetry in General
- XXXVI. Turkish Poetry
- XXXVII. Arabian Poetry
- XXXVIII. Persian Poetry
- XXXIX. Indian (Sanskrit and Hindoo) Poetry
- XL. Sumerian and Babylonian Poetry
- XLI. Egyptian Poetry
- XLII. Ancient Hebrew Poetry
- XLIII. Chinese Poetry
- XLIV. Japanese Poetry

---

[1] Under this and subsequent headings the general method of arrangement is as follows: A. *Bibliography*, 1. *General* (*or Retrospective*), 2 etc. *Particular Periods*: B. *Histories*, 1. *General*, 2 etc. *Particular Periods*; C. *Periodicals and Series of Monographs.*

A BRIEF BIBLIOGRAPHY OF THE HISTORY OF POETRY

The more important works are marked with asterisks. Monographs on lyric, epic, and allied types are not included in this bibliography; they are cited in the historical sections (§§ 5, 6, 11, 12) of this work.

I. Bibliography of Bibliographies.

A. *Retrospective.* J. PETZHOLD, Bibliotheca Bibliographica (Leipz.: 1866). / L. VALLÉE, Bibliographie des bibliographies (2 pts. Paris: 1883. Supplément, 1887). / British Museum Library, List of Bibliographical Works in the Reading Room (2d ed. Lond.: 1889). / *H. STEIN, Manuel de bibliographie générale (Paris: 1897). See the 11th division (Philologie et belles-lettres) and the 3d appendix (Répertoire des catalogues d'imprimés des principales bibliothèques du monde entier). In most respects the work of Stein has superseded the bibliographies of Petzhold and Vallée. / *W. P. COURTNEY, Register of National Bibliography, with a selection of the chief bibliographical books and articles printed in other countries (3 vols. Lond.: 1905–1912). / *R. A. PEDDIE, National Bibliographies: a descriptive catalogue of the works which register the books published in each country (Lond.: 1912), — a most helpful little work. The following sentences from the Preface should be noted by every student: "The official, semi-official and trade bibliographies of a country are the bases of all bibliographical work. From them we learn (imperfectly, in most cases) what books are published, and their subject-indexes give us the first instalment of titles for our special bibliographies. It is necessary for all who make researches in any way touching the bibliographical field to become acquainted with these most valuable tools, and in the following pages they are described for the first time at length." / Another very helpful work of similar purpose and scope is the New York State Library Bulletin 38, "Selected National Bibliographies" (1st ed., Bulletin 7, 1900; 3d ed., No. 38, Albany, N. Y.: 1915). / *A. B. KROEGER, Guide to the Study and Use of Reference Books (3d ed., by I. G. Mudge. American Lib. Assoc. Chicago: 1917). This little manual (235 pp.) helps the student to acquire quickly a knowledge of the most important works of reference, primarily of those written in English, but also of some of the more general works in French and German. / For a similar work see New York State Library Bulletin 84, "A Selection of Cataloguers' Reference Books in N. Y. State Library" (Albany, N. Y.: 1908).

For other works see A. G. S. Josephson, Bibliographies of Bibliographies Chronologically Arranged (Chicago: 1901; 2d ed. 1913; reprinted from the Bulletin of the Bibliographical Soc. of America, 1910–1912, and the Papers of the same Society, 1912–1913).

B. *Current.* For annuals which record new bibliographies see the American Library Annual (N. Y., Office of the *Publishers' Weekly*: 1911–1912 +), which succeeded the Annual Library Index (1905–1910) and the previous Annual Literary Index (1892–1904). / See also the Bibliographie des Bibliotheks- und Buchwesens (Beihefte zum Zentralblatt für Bibliothekswesen. Leipz.: 1905 +).

II. Encyclopedias.

ERSCH and GRUBER, Allgemeine Encyklopädie der Wissenschaften und Künste (87 vols. Leipz.: 1818–1887). The most copious German encyclopedia, but not up to date. / P. A. LAROUSSE, Grand dictionnaire universel du 19e siècle (15 vols. Paris: 1866–1876, with two supplementary vols. in 1878, 1887–1890). Similar to the Century Dictionary; still important and helpful, but not up to date. / Nuova enciclopedia italiana (6th ed. 25 vols. Torino: 1875–1888; Supplement, 5 vols., 1889–1890). / *La grande encyclopédie (31 vols. Paris: 1886–1903), — the standard French encyclopedia. / Diccionario enciclopédico hispano-americano (28 vols. in 29. Barcelona: 1887–1910). / Brockhaus' Konversations-Lexikon (14th ed. 17 vols. Leipz.: 1892–1895; the 1908 Jubiläums ed. was not revised). Admirable and popular; brief articles. / *Meyers grosses Konversations-Lexikon (6th ed. 24 vols. Leipz.: 1902–1912, with biennial supplements). / *Enciclopedia universal ilustrada europeo-americana (Barcelona: 1905 +). The standard Spanish work. / *The Encyclopædia Britannica (11th ed. 29 vols. Cambridge: 1910–1911). Replete with modern, authoritative, and readable articles which should always be consulted. / *New International Encyclopædia (2d ed. 23 vols. N. Y.: 1914–1916).

III. Academic Dissertations.

A. *Of Universities in General.* Bibliothèque nationale, Catalogue des dissertations et écrits académiques provenant des échanges avec les universités étrangères et reçus par la Bibliothèque nationale, 1883–1912 (Paris: 1884–1914; published annually). "Arranged alphabetically by universities. Useful principally for universities in countries for which there is no current national list. For French, German or Swiss theses the national lists are more useful."

B. *Of French Universities.* For years earlier than 1884 use A. MAIRE's Répertoire alphabétique des thèses de doctorat ès lettres des universités françaises, 1810–1900 (Paris: 1903), which has a subject index as well as an alphabetical arrangement by authors' names; also *A. MOURIER et F. DELTOUR's Notice sur le doctorat ès lettres, suivie du catalogue et de l'analyse des thèses françaises et latines admises par les facultés des lettres depuis 1810 (4th ed. Paris: 1881), which in large part duplicates Maire's Répertoire, but gives a table of contents for each thesis; it contains indexes of authors and subjects; continued by the same authors' annual Catalogue et analyse des thèses françaises et latines, etc. (21 vols. Paris: 1882–1901. No more published). / For theses published from 1884 on, the best list is the official *Catalogue des thèses et écrits académiques of the Ministère de l'instruction publique et des beaux-arts (Paris: 1885+). Published annually, arranged by universities, with an author index; five yearly issues make a volume and each volume has indexes of authors and subjects.

C. *Of German and Austrian Universities.* R. KLUSSMANN, Systematisches Verzeichniss der Abhandlungen welche in den Schulschriften sämtlicher an dem Programmtausche teilnehmenden Lehranstalten erschienen sind, 1876–1885, 1886–1890, 1891–1895, 1896–1900 (4 vols. Leipz.: 1889–1903). See the same author's annual bibliography of dissertations, programmes, etc. in the *Berl. philol. Wochenschrift.* / W. ALTMANN, Die Doktordissertationen der deutschen Universitäten, 1885–1890 (Berlin: 1891). / For current bibliography see *G. FOCK's Bibliographischer Monatsbericht über neu erschienene Schul- und Universitätsschriften, 1889+ (Leipz.: 1890+; annual author and subject indexes), the *Jahresverzeichniss der an den deutschen Universitäten erschienenen Schriften, 1885+ (Berlin: 1887+; author index in each vol.; separate subject index for vols. 1–5, after that included in each vol.), which is the official list, as is also the *Jahresverzeichniss der an den deutschen Schulanstalten erschienenen Abhandlungen, 1889+ (Berlin: 1890+).

D. *Of Swiss Universities.* Jahresverzeichniss der schweizerischen Universitätsschriften, 1897+ (Basel: 1898+).

E. *Of American Universities.* *Library of Congress, List of American Doctoral Dissertations, 1912+ (Washington: 1913+). Annual publication with alphabetical and classified lists and index of subjects. See Introduction to Vol. I for earlier printed lists of American theses.

F. *Of Scandinavian Universities.* See Kroeger (cited above, under I, A), p. 28.

IV. **Literature in General.**

A. *Bibliography.*

1. *Manuals.* G. GEORGI, Allgemeines europäisches Bücher-Lexicon, von dem Anfange des 16. Seculi bis 1739 (4 pts. in 1 vol. Leipz.: 1742); 5th pt., French authors (Leipz.: 1753); Erstes [bis drittes] Supplement 1739–1757 (3 vols. Leipz.: 1750–1758). / R. WATT, Bibliotheca Britannica, or a general index to British and foreign literature (4 vols. Edinb.: 1824), — not always accurate. / F. A. EBERT, General Bibliographical Dictionary, from the German of F. A. Ebert (4 vols. Oxford: 1837). / *J. C. BRUNET, Manuel du libraire et de l'amateur de livres (5th augmented edition. 6 vols. Paris: 1860–1865). Index in vol. VI. With this use P. DESCHAMPS et

G. Brunet, Supplément au Manuel du libraire (2 vols. Paris: 1878–1880). These works contain a bibliography of rare and valuable printed books in various languages; especially rich in French and Latin titles and in books older than the 19th century. / *J. G. T. Grässe, Trésor de livres rares et précieux (7 vols. Dresden: 1859–1869. Reprinted, 8 vols. Paris: 1900–1901), — similar to Brunet, but with a greater number of German entries.

Especially helpful to the student of poetry are the two handbooks of *Quadrio (1739–1752) and *Sulzer-Blankenburg (1771–1774; 1796–1798), mentioned above, § 2.

Bibliography of ancient and modern philology for the years 1848–1897 is contained in the **Bibliotheca Philologica* (Göttingen).

2. *Library Catalogues*. (a) *Author Catalogues*. Reference to the catalogues of the largest and oldest libraries is one of the best and readiest means of gathering information concerning the published works of authors. / *British Museum Library, Catalogue of Printed Books (95 vols. Lond.: 1881–1900). Supplement (13 vols. Lond.: 1900–1905). Complete through 1899. / *Verzeichniss der aus der neu erschienenen Lit. von der Königlichen Bibliothek zu Berlin erworbenen Druckschriften (Berlin: 1892 +), — especially helpful because it is issued yearly. / *Catalogue général des livres imprimés de la Bibliothèque nationale (67+ vols. Paris: 1897+). Vol. 67 (1917) extends to *Halmont*. / *Library of Congress, Depository Catalogue. "Certain libraries in leading centers of research have been made depositories for complete sets of Library of Congress printed cards. By consulting a depository set one may find out whether a certain book is in the Library of Congress."

(b) *Subject Catalogues*. One of the first steps in compiling the bibliography of a subject is to consult the subject index of a large library. Among published subject-catalogues the following are especially valuable: *British Museum Library, Subject Index of the Modern Works added to the Library, 1881–1900 (ed. by G. K. Fortescue. 3 vols. Lond.: 1902–1903). Alphabetically arranged. No personal names as headings; for such see the author catalogue. Includes 155,000 entries. Continued by five-yearly supplements (1901–1905. Lond.: 1906; 1906–1910. Lond.: 1911). / *London Library, Subject Index, by C. T. Hagberg Wright (Lond.: 1909). / See also the subject indexes or dictionary catalogues of the Astor Library, N. Y., the Boston Athenæum, the Peabody Institute, Baltimore, the Pittsburgh Carnegie Library, etc.

B. *Histories*. J. G. T. Grässe, Lehrbuch einer allgemeinen Literärgesch. aller bekannten Völker der Welt von der ältesten bis auf die neueste Zeit (4 vols. in 7. 1837–1859), — a work of extraordinary industry, with much bibliographical material. / K. Rosenkranz, Die Poesie und ihre Gesch. (1855), — traces the development of the ideals of beauty, wisdom, and freedom in the world's literature. Written by an Hegelian romanticist. Compare his earlier Handbuch einer allgemeinen Gesch. der Poesie (1832–1833). / F. Loise, De l'influence de la civilisation sur la poésie (Bruxelles: 1859; in Mém. pub. par l'Académie royale, vol. VIII of the octavo collection), — an essay, not a history. / *M. CARRIERE, Die Kunst im Zusammenhang der Culturentwickelung und die Ideale der Menschheit (3d ed. 5 vols. Leipz.: 1877–1886). Cited above, § 2; a stimulating work. / G. BORNHAK, Lexikon der allgemeinen Litteraturgesch. (Leipz.: 1882). A brief dictionary of non-German literatures. / *A. DE GUBERNATIS, Storia universale della lett. (18 vols. in 23. Milano: 1883–1885). Cited above, § 5. / C. LETOURNEAU, L'Évolution lit. dans les diverses races humaines (Paris: 1894). A suggestive but superficial study of the beginnings of literature among primitive races and of its development among barbaric and civilized peoples (to the Middle Ages). / J. SCHERR, Allgemeine Gesch. der Lit. (Stuttgart: 1850. 9th ed. 1895), — superficial and prejudiced, but popular. / *A. BAUMGARTNER, Gesch. der Weltliteratur (4th ed. 5 vols. Freiburg i. B.: 1901–1905). Especially valuable for the literatures of the Orient (vols. I, II); contains helpful introductions to literatures not cited in the present work, such as the Coptic, Ethiopic, Georgian, Tamil, Malayan, Burmese, Thibetan, and Tartar. / G. KARPELES, Storia universale della lett. (4 vols. Milano: 1903–1907). / *P. E. F. HINNEBERG (editor), Die Kultur der Gegenwart, ihre Entwickelung und ihre Ziele (22 vols. Berlin: 1905–1914). The following volumes, of unequal merit but modern and authoritative, are concerned with the history of literature: T. I, Abt. VII Die Anfänge der Lit.; Die Lit. der primitiven Völker; Die orientalischen Lit. (1906); T. I, Abt. VIII Die griechische und lateinische Lit. (1905); T. I, Abt. IX Die osteuropäischen Lit. (1908); T. I, Abt. XI, 1 Die romanischen Lit. . . . mit Einschluss des keltischen (1909). / *O. HAUSER, Weltgesch. der Lit. (2 vols. Leipz.: 1910), — with carefully selected bibliographies of books of reference.

The histories of literature by D. P. NORRENBERG (Allgemeine Gesch. d. Lit. 2d ed. 3 vols. Münster: 1896) and A. STERN (Gesch. d. Weltlit. Stuttgart: 1888) give little aid to the specialist. For other works see R. F. ARNOLD's Allgemeine Bücherkunde (Strassburg: 1910), pp. 42–50; cf. Gayley and Scott, pp. 378–379.

C. *Periodicals.*

1. *Indexes.* (a) *General.* Bibliographie der fremdsprachigen Zeitschriftenliteratur, 1911+ (Leipz.: 1911+; being Abt. B of the Internationale Bibliographie der Zeitschriftenliteratur), — "indexes about 2000 periodicals and general works in English and all the principal foreign languages except German." Subject and author indexes.

(b) *French and Belgian.* Argus des revues, indicateur universel, contient des articles provenant de près de 1000 revues françaises et étrangères (Paris: 1880–1914). A bimonthly subject list of the more important articles of general interest. Discontinued at the outbreak of war, 1914. / Répertoire bibliographique des principales revues françaises, 1897–1899 (3 vols. Paris: 1898–1900), — subject and author indexes. / Bibliographie de Belgique: Sommaire des périodiques, 1897–1913 (17 vols. Bruxelles: 1897–1913), discontinued at the outbreak of war, 1914.

(c) *Italian*. Catalogo metodico degli scritti contenuti nelle pubblicazioni periodiche italiane e straniere. Parte 1ª. Scritti biografici e critici (7 vols. Parlamento, Camera dei deputati, Biblioteca. Roma: 1885–1914. Supplementary volumes every sixth year). Subject and author indexes of the materials indicated. Vol. I, to 1883; supplementary vols., 1884+. See the Indice generale a tutto l'anno 1906 (Roma: 1909), covering all names through 1906.

(d) *English and American*. *Poole's Index to Periodical Literature, 1802–Jan. 1, 1907 (2 vols. Boston: 1891; supplements, 5 vols. 1887–1908), the most important index to American and English periodicals; subject index only. / *Review of Reviews, Index to the Periodicals of 1890–1902 (13 vols. Lond. and N.Y.: 1891–1903), covers many English periodicals not indexed in Poole; subject index with some author entries. / Annual Literary Index, 1892–1904 (13 vols. N.Y. *Publishers' Weekly*: 1893–1905), American and English periodicals, essays, book chapters, etc.; subject, author, and other indexes, the subject index serving as a valuable supplement to Poole. / Cumulative Index to a Selected List of Periodicals, 1896–1903 (8 vols. Cleveland, Ohio: 1897–1903; consolidated with the Readers' Guide (see below), July 1903), — "occasionally useful for material not included in the corresponding volumes of Poole." / Annual Library Index, 1905–1910 (6 vols. N.Y. *Publishers' Weekly*: 1906–1911), the successor of the Annual Literary Index, noted above; succeeded (1911) by the index noted next; combined author and subject indexes of American and English periodicals, essays, book chapters, etc. / *Readers' Guide to Periodical Literature, 1900+ (White Plains, N.Y.: 1905+), a cumulative, current index with quinquennial and annual volumes and monthly lists cumulating quarterly, supplemented by special volumes containing indexes to additional periodicals for the years 1907–1915, 1913–1916; at first of narrow scope, but from 1911 on very extensive and of admirable arrangement. / *Magazine Subject-Index (Boston: 1908), subject index of periodicals not listed in Poole, Readers' Guide, or Annual Library Index, with special attention to English magazines; supplemented by annual volumes, 1908+ (8+ vols. Boston: 1909–1916+). / *Athenæum Subject Index to Periodicals, 1915+ (Lond.: 1916+), preliminary class lists and annual volumes, dealing principally with English and American periodicals but also with some foreign journals.

(e) *German*. *Bibliographie der deutschen Zeitschriftenliteratur, mit Einschluss von Sammelwerken, 1896+ (Leipz.: 1897+), published semiannually; not cumulative; subject and author indexes; later volumes covering about 3000 periodicals. Eight Ergänzungsbände (1908–1915) carry the indexing back to 1885.

(f) *Danish*, *Dutch*, *Norwegian*, *Russian*. See KROEGER, pp. 9, 10.

(g) *Book Reviews*. Book Review Digest, 1905+ (White Plains, N.Y.: 1905+), "A digest and index of selected book reviews in over fifty English and American periodicals, principally general in character; from the public library point of view, less useful in the college or university library; monthly, with semi-annual and annual cumulations." / *Bibliographie der Rezensionen, mit Einschluss von Referaten und Selbstanzeigen (Leipz.: 1901 +), very extensive (about 3000 German and 2000 other periodicals), and useful in the university library.

2. *Bibliographies.* Since the periodicals with which the literary student is concerned are for the most part enumerated under the divisions below, it is sufficient at this place to refer the student to the bibliography of periodicals (General, American, English, French, German, Russian, Swedish, and Swiss) listed in Kroeger, pp. 16–19 and (publications of learned societies) 29–31. Concerning Spanish periodicals of the 19th century the patient student may gather information in M. Ossorio y Bernard's Ensayo de un catálogo de periodistas españoles del siglo XIX (Madrid: 1903); more helpful is *D. E. Hartzenbusch's Apuntes para un catálogo de periódicos madrileños desde el año 1661 al 1870 (Madrid: 1894).

3. *Short List of Periodicals of International Scope.* (a) *French.* **Journal des savants* (Paris: 1665 +; J. Tissier, Table analytique du *Journal des savants*, 1859–1908. Paris: 1909), — reviews; invaluable as a record of the chief works of French literature since 1665. / *Mercure de France* (Paris: 1672 +), — radical, unacademic. / *Hist. de l'Académie royale des inscriptions et belles-lettres*, etc. (Paris: 1717–1843), and *Mémoires présentés par divers savants à l'Académie des inscriptions et belles-lettres de l'Institut impérial de France* (1844 +). / *Hist. et mémoires de l'Institut royal de France* (Paris: 1815 +; later, *Mémoires de l'Institut national de France*). / **Revue des deux mondes* (Paris: 1829 +), — the chief of French periodicals. / *Académie des inscriptions et belles-lettres, comptes rendus des séances* (Paris: 1858 +). / *Revue bleue* (Paris: 1863 +), — political and literary. / **Revue critique d'hist. et de litt.* (Paris: 1866 +), — critical reviews, bibliography. / *Annales de la faculté des lettres de Bordeaux* (Bordeaux: 1879–1894, / then, *Revue des universités du midi*, 1895–1898, / then, *Revue des études anciennes*, 1899, and *Bulletin italien*, 1901 +). / **Revue des cours et conférences* (Paris: 1892 +), — reviews of the lectures of the most prominent French savants.

(b) *Italian.* **Nuova antologia di scienze, lettere ed arti* (Firenze, Roma: 1866 +), continuation of *Antologia* (Firenze: 1821–1833). / *Fanfulla della domenica* (Roma: 1879 +). / *La rassegna nazionale* (Firenze: 1879 +).

(c) *English.* **The Gentleman's Magazine* (Lond.: 1731–1907), — an invaluable record of contemporary opinion of works of English literature. / **The Monthly Review* (Lond.: 1749–1845). / *The Quarterly Review* (Lond.: 1809 +). / *The Edinburgh Review* (Edinb.: 1814 +). / **Blackwood's Edinburgh Review*, later, *Magazine* (Edinb.: 1817 +). / *The Westminster Review* (Lond.: 1824 +). / *The Foreign Quarterly Review* (Lond.: 1827–1847). / **The Athenæum* (Lond.: 1828 +). / *Fraser's Magazine* (Lond.: 1830–1882). / *The Spectator* (Lond.: 1832 +). / *The Dublin University Magazine* (Dublin: 1833–1880). / **The Dublin Review* (Lond.: 1836 +). / *The North British*

Review (Edinb., Lond.: 1844–1871). / **The British Quarterly Review* (Lond.: 1845–1886). / *Notes and Queries* (Lond.: 1850 +), — a medium of communication between students. / *London Quarterly Review* (Lond.: 1853 +). / *The National Review* (Theobald, etc. Lond.: 1855–1864) (not to be confused with the political *National Review* (Allen & Co., Lond.: 1883 +), which has little of literary interest). / *The Saturday Review* (Lond.: 1855 +). / *Macmillan's Magazine* (Lond.: 1859–1907). / **The Cornhill Magazine* (Lond.: 1860 +). / *Temple Bar* (Lond.: 1860–1906). / **The Fortnightly Review* (Lond.: 1865 +). / **The Contemporary Review* (Lond.: 1866 +). / **The Academy* (Lond.: 1869 +). / *The Scottish Review* (Lond.: 1882 +). / *The New Review* (Lond.: 1889–1897). / *Folk-Lore* (Lond.: 1890 +). / *The English Review* (Lond.: 1908 +). / **The British Review* (Lond.: 1913 +).

Most of the English Reviews contain excellent constructive criticism of works of English and foreign literature.

(d) *American* (*United States*). *The Eclectic Magazine of Foreign Lit., Science and Art* (N.Y.: 1844–1907). / **The Nation* (N.Y.: 1865 +). / *The Princeton Review*, later, *The New Princeton Review* (N.Y.: 1878–1888). / **The Dial* (Chicago: 1880 +). / *The Critic* (N.Y.: 1881–1906). / *The Forum* (N.Y.: 1886 +). / *The Open Court* (Chicago: 1887 +). / *Journal of American Folk-Lore* (Boston, etc.: 1888 +). / *Poet Lore* (Philadelphia, Boston: 1889 +). / *The Arena* (Boston: 1890–1909). / *The Sewanee Review* (Sewanee, Tenn.: 1892 +). / *The Yale Review* (Boston: 1893 +). / *The Bookman* (N.Y.: 1895 +). / **The International Monthly*, later, *Quarterly* (Burlington, Vt., N.Y.: 1900–1906). / *The South Atlantic Quarterly* (Durham, N.C.: 1902 +). / **The Mid-West Quarterly* (N.Y.: 1913 +). / *The New Republic* (N.Y.: 1914 +).

(e) *German*. **Göttingische gelehrte Anzeigen* (Göttingen, Berlin: 1753 +; continuation of *Göttingische Zeitungen von gelehrten Sachen*, 1739–1853), — reviews of learned works in all fields. / *Sokrates*, formerly *Zeitschr. für das Gymnasialwesen* (Berlin: 1847 +). / *Zeitschr. für die österreichischen Gymnasien* (Wien: 1850 +). / *Zeitschr. für Völkerpsychologie und Sprachwissenschaft* (1860–1890), — especially valuable for the student of the epic and early narrative poetry. / *Das literarische Echo* (Berlin: 1898 +), — belletristic. / *Neue philologische Rundschau* (Gotha: 1904–1908), — reviews. / See also the more popular magazines, such as *Deutsche Revue* (1875 +), *Deutsche Rundschau* (1874 +), *Die Gegenwart* (1871 +), *Die Grenzboten* (1841 +), *Nord und Süd* (1877 +), *Die Nation* (1882 +). / See also the *Lit. Centralblatt* and the *Deutsche Literaturzeitung*, noted below, XXIV, C.

V. Classical Poetry in General.

A. *Bibliography* (editions and collections, translations, literary history, and criticism).

1. *General*. For an account of the history of classical philology, see SIR JOHN SANDYS' Hist. of Classical Scholarship (3 vols. Vol. I, from the 6th cent. B.C. to the end of the Middle Ages, 2d ed. Cambridge:

1906; vols. II, III, to the 18th and 19th cents. 1908); for a brief account, the article Classics in the Encyc. Brit., 11th ed. / *S. REINACH'S Manuel de philologie classique (2d ed., with a bibliography for the years 1884–1904. Paris: 1904) and E. HÜBNER'S Bibliographie der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft, Grundriss zu Vorlesungen über die Geschichte und Encyklopädie der klassischen Philologie (2d ed. Berlin: 1889) contain convenient lists of the more important titles.

2. *1700–1878.* *W. ENGELMANN, Bibliotheca Scriptorum Classicorum (8th ed. 2 vols. Leipz.: 1880–1882), — confused, uncritical, indispensable.

3. *1878–1896.* *R. KLUSSMANN, Bibliotheca Scriptorum Classicorum et Graecorum et Latinorum (in Bursian's Jahresbericht über die Fortschritte der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft: Greek writers, vols. 146, 151. Leipz.: 1909–1911; Latin writers, vols. 156–165. 1912–1913), — an excellent work.

4. *Later years and current.* *BURSIAN'S Jahresbericht, just mentioned (1873 +), which includes a Bibliotheca Philologica Classica (1874 +). / **Berliner philologische Wochenschrift* (Berlin, etc.: 1881–1882 +), which also includes a Bibliotheca Philologica Classica (1887 +). / **Wochenschrift für klassische Philologie* (Berlin: 1884 +). / Bulletin bibliographique, etc., du Musée belge (Louvain: 1898 +).

B. *Encyclopedias, Histories.* A. BOECKH'S Encyclopädie und Methodologie der philologischen Wissenschaften (2d ed., edited by R. Klussmann. Leipz.: 1886) is compendious and, although antiquated in many respects, still valuable both for bibliographical aid and for Boeckh's remarks on the poetic kinds and their evolution (cf. Gayley and Scott, pp. 13, 213, and Index). / In *PAULY-WISSOWA'S Real-Encyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft (11 vols. Stuttgart: 1894–1914) are some of the most authoritative articles on types, periods, and authors.

The histories of Greek and Roman literature conjointly considered (for lists see Boeckh, Encycl. und Method., 2d ed., p. 747; Schanz, Gesch. d. röm. Lit., 3d ed., 1: 1, p. 7) are of little importance.

C. *Periodicals.* *Rheinisches Museum für Philol.* (Bonn, etc.: 1827 +). / *Neue Jahrbücher für Philol. und Paedagogik* (Leipz.: 1831–1897), continued as *Neue Jahrbücher für das klassische Altertum*, etc. (Leipz.: 1898 +). / **Philologus* (Göttingen: 1846 +). / **Revue de philol., de litt. et d'hist. anciennes* (Paris: 1845 +), containing the valuable **Revue des revues*, — brief résumés of the classical reviews. / *Mnemosyne* (Leyden: 1852). / *Jahrbücher für classische Philol.* (Leipz.: 1855–1903). / **Hermes* (Berlin: 1866 +). / **The Journal of Philology* (Lond.: 1868 +). / *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association* (Hartford, Conn., Boston: 1869 +), — in greater part devoted to the classics, but including articles on modern literature. / *Rivista di filologia* (Torino: 1873 +). / *Wiener Studien, Zeitschr. für class. Philol.* (1879 +). / **American Journal of Philol.* (Baltimore, etc.: 1880 +). / **Classical Review* (Lond.: 1887 +). / *Studi italiani di filologia classica* (Firenze: 1893 +). / **Classical Journal* (Chicago: 1905 +). / **Classical Philol.* (Chicago: 1906 +). / **Classical Quarterly* (Lond.: 1907 +).

Among the collections of monographs mention may be made of the *Leipziger Studien zur classischen Philol.* (1878–1902), / *Philol. Untersuchungen* (1880–1912), / *Berliner Studien für classische Philol. und Archaeol.* (1883–1898); and the classical series of the following universities: Berlin, Breslau, California, Cambridge, Chicago, Cornell, Erlangen, Halle, Harvard, Leipzig, Manchester, Michigan, Oxford, Wien, etc. (see Catalogue of the British Museum Library, under Academies).

VI. **Greek Poetry.**

A. *Bibliography.*

1. *Retrospective.* *J. A. FABRICIUS, Bibliotheca Graeca (14 vols. 1705–1728. Ed., G. C. Harless, 12 vols. Hamburg: 1790–1809, incomplete; index, 1838). This great bibliography of manuscripts, texts, notices, monographs, etc., covering the entire range of Greek literature down to the fall of Constantinople (1453), is "founded, so far as possible, on a first-hand knowledge of every edition quoted, and it has supplied the basis for all subsequent histories of Greek literature. The 350 quarto pages, assigned to Homer alone, include indices to all the authors cited in the scholia and in Eustathius." Only the advanced student will make use of it. / For most practical purposes *P. MASQUERAY's little handbook, Bibliographie pratique de la lit. grecque des origines à la fin de la période romaine (Paris: 1914), is very helpful. / So also is *L. LAURAND's Manuel des études grecques et latines, Fasc. II, Lit. grecque (Paris: 1914).

2. *Current.* See above, V, A, 4.

B. *Histories.* H. ULRICI, Gesch. der hellenischen Dichtkunst (2 vols. Berlin: 1835). / G. BERNHARDY, Grundriss der griech. Lit. (2 pts. Halle: 1836–1845; 5th ed. of vol. I, by R. Volkmann, 1892; 3d ed. of vol. II, 2d impression, 1880). Bernhardy was a student and follower of F. A. Wolf, for whom see above, § 11. / K. O. MÜLLER, Hist. of the Lit. of Ancient Greece (3 vols. Translated from the German manuscript by G. C. Lewis and J. W. Donaldson, 1840–1842; completed by Donaldson, 1858; 1st German ed. 2 vols. Breslau: 1841; 4th German ed., by E. Heitz, 1882–1884). / W. MURE, Critical Hist. of the Lang. and Lit. of Ancient Greece (5 vols. Lond.: 1850–1857; 2d ed. 4 vols., to Alexander, omitting drama and oratory, 1859). / T. BERGK, Griech. Literaturgesch. (Berlin: 1872–1887; vols. II, III, ed. by G. Heinrichs; vol. IV, by R. Peppmüller). / R. NICOLAI, Griech. Literaturgesch. in neuer Bearbeitung (3 vols. Magdeburg: 1873–1878; with addition of Byzantine literature, 1 vol., 1883). / *J. P. MAHAFFY, Hist. of Classical Greek Lit. (2 vols. Lond.: 1880; 4th ed. 1903). / K. SITTL, Gesch. der griech. Lit. bis auf Alexander den Grossen (3 vols. München: 1884–1887). / *A. and M. CROISET, Hist. de la litt. grecque (5 vols. Paris: 1887–1899; 2d enlarged ed. 1896–1901; 3d ed. 1910+). / *W. VON CHRIST, Gesch. der griech. Lit. bis auf die Zeit Justinians (1889; 5th ed., revised by O. Stählin and W. Schmid, 3 vols. München: 1908–1913; being Bd. VII of I. von Müller's Handb. d. klass.

Altertums-Wissenschaft), — authoritative, recent, standard, with bibliography; the best work for the student.

Of the smaller histories the following are most useful. T. S. PERRY, Hist. of Greek Lit. (N. Y.: 1890). / *R. C. JEBB, The Growth and Influence of Classical Greek Poetry (Lond.: 1893). / G. MURRAY, A Hist. of Ancient Greek Lit. (Lits. of the World, ed., E. Gosse. N. Y.: 1897). / *F. B. JEVONS, Hist. of Greek Lit. (3d ed. 1900). / H. N. FOWLER, Hist. of Ancient Greek Lit. (N. Y.: 1902). / A. and M. CROISET, Manuel d'hist. de la litt. grecque (1900. English trans. by G. F. Heffelbower. N. Y.: 1904). / L. WHIBLEY (ed.), A Companion to Greek Studies (2d ed. Camb.: 1906). / *E. BETHE, Die griechische Poesie, in A. Gercke and E. Norden, Einleitung in die Altertumswissenschaft, Bd. I (Leipz.: 1910). / Greek Lit., A Series of Lectures delivered at Columbia University (N. Y.: 1912). / *U. VON WILAMOWITZ-MOELLENDORFF (in Hinneberg's Kultur der Gegenwart, 3d ed. 1912).

C. *Periodicals.* To the list given above, V, C, may be added the *Revue des études grecques* (Paris: 1888 +), containing monographs, current bibliography, etc.

VII. Pagan Greek Poetry of the Alexandrian and Roman Periods.

A. *Bibliography.* See above, under V and VI; also SUSEMIHL, as noted below. MASQUERAY and LAURAND are helpful.

B. *Histories.* G. BERNHARDY (1836–1845) and R. NICOLAI (1873–1878), cited above, VI, B. / *A. COUAT, La poésie alexandrine sous les premiers Ptolémées (Paris: 1882). / J. P. MAHAFFY, Greek Life and Thought from the Age of Alexander to the Roman Conquest (Lond.: 1887). / *W. SCHMID, Der Atticismus (5 vols. Stuttgart: 1887–1897). / *F. SUSEMIHL, Gesch. der griechischen Lit. in der Alexandrinerzeit (2 vols. Leipz.: 1891–1892). / *L. HAHN, Rom und Romanismus im griechisch-römischen Osten (Leipz.: 1906). / *W. VON CHRIST (1908–1913), *A. and M. CROISET (1900 etc.), and U. VON WILAMOWITZ-MOELLENDORFF (1912), cited above, VI, B. / C. CESSI, La poesia ellenistica (Bari: 1912).

VIII. Greek Christian Poetry to the Byzantine Period.

A. *Bibliography and Histories.* G. KRÜGER, Gesch. der altchristlichen Lit. in den ersten drei Jahrhunderten (Freiburg: 1895). / P. BATIFFOL, Anciennes littératures chrétiennes, I La litt. grecque (4th ed. Paris: 1901). / O. BARDENHEWER, Les Pères de l'Église, leur vie et leurs œuvres (French trans., 3 vols. 2d ed. Paris: 1905; 3d German ed. 1 vol. Freiburg: 1910). / See also MASQUERAY and LAURAND, cited above, VI, A.

B. *Periodicals.* See BATIFFOL, p. 337.

IX. Byzantine Poetry.

A. *Bibliography.* See above, under VI; also KRUMBACHER and the periodicals noted below.

B. *Histories.* G. BERNHARDY (1836–1845), K. O. MÜLLER and J. W. DONALDSON (1858), and NICOLAI (1883), cited above, VI, B. / *K. KRUMBACHER, Gesch. der byzantinischen Lit. 527–1453 (2d ed. München: 1897; being Bd. IX, Abt. 1 of I. von Müller's Handb. d. klass. Altertums-Wissenschaft). An admirable work; in places, perhaps, somewhat one-sided, as in its account of Byzantine drama. It contains ample bibliographies, prefixed and appended to the work as a whole as well as to a great variety of names, periods, and topics. / For brief accounts by the same authority see *Byzantine Lit. (under the article Greek Lit.) in the Encyc. Brit., 11th ed. (1910), and the proper section in Hinneberg's Kultur der Gegenwart (T. 1: Abt. 8, 3d ed. 1912).

C. *Periodicals.* **Die byzantinische Zeitschrift* (Leipz.: 1892 +). / *Vizantijskij vremennik* (Petrograd: 1894 +). / *Byzantinisches Archiv* (1898 +).

X. Roman Poetry.

A. *Bibliography.*

1. *Retrospective.* *J. A. FABRICIUS, Bibliotheca Latina (Hamburg: 1697, — classical period only; revised ed. 3 vols. 1721–1722; also, 2 vols. Venezia: 1728, which is better than J. A. Ernesti's ed., 3 vols. in 2, Leipz.: 1773–1774). This work was extended by Fabricius' Bibliotheca Latina Mediae et Infimae Aetatis (5 vols. 1734; supplement by Schöttgen, 1746; also, ed. by Mansi, Padova: 1754; also, 6 vols. in 3, Firenze: 1858–1859). This great work is similar in scope and method to Fabricius' Bibliotheca Graeca, described above, VI, A, 1. / For small handbooks see J. E. B. MAYOR, Bibliographical Clue to Latin Lit., edited after Dr. E. Hübner (Lond.: 1875); E. W. E. HÜBNER, Grundriss zu Vorlesungen über die römische Littgesch. (4th ed. Berlin: 1878). / Particularly convenient are the bibliographical notes in the literary histories of BERNHARDY, TEUFFEL, and *SCHANZ.

2. *Current.* See above, V, A, 4.

B. *Histories.* J. C. F. BÄHR, Gesch. der römischen Lit. (1828; 4th ed. 3 vols. 1868–1870; with three supplementary vols.: Christian poets and historians, 1836, 2d ed. 1872; Christian theologians, 1837; Carolingian Age, 1840). / G. BERNHARDY, Grundriss der römischen Lit. (Halle: 1830; 5th ed. Braunschweig: 1872), — Hegelian tendency; an attempt to view the literature in relation to national character and culture. / *T. MOMMSEN, Römische Gesch. (3 vols. 1854–1856), — see the sections on literature. / *W. S. TEUFFEL, Gesch. der römischen Lit. (Leipz.: 1870; 5th ed., revised by L. Schwabe, 1890; 6th ed., ed. by W. Kroll and F. Skutsch, vol. II, 1910; English trans., Hist. of Roman Lit., by G. C. W. Warr, 2 vols. Lond.: 1891–1892). / *G. A. SIMCOX, A Hist. of Latin Lit. from Ennius to Boethius (2 vols. Lond.: 1883). / *O. RIBBECK, Gesch. der römischen Dichtung (3 vols. Stuttgart: 1887–1892; vols. I, II, 2d ed. 1894–1900). / *M. SCHANZ, Gesch. der römischen Lit. bis zum Gesetzgebungswerk des Kaisers Justinian

(4 pts., in various editions. München: 1890–1914; being Bd. VIII of I. von Müller's Handb. d. klass. Altertums-Wissenschaft), — authoritative, recent, standard; with bibliography. / *C. LAMARRE, Hist. de la litt. latine (8 vols. Paris: 1901–1907), — to the end of the Augustan Age.

Of the smaller histories the following may be mentioned. *W. Y. SELLAR, The Roman Poets of the Republic (3d ed. Oxford: 1889); *by the same, The Roman Poets of the Augustan Age (Oxford: 1892), Horace and the Elegiac Poets (1892). / *E. NAGEOTTE, Hist. de la litt. latine jusqu'au VI^e^ siècle de notre ère (5th ed. Paris: 1894). / TYRRELL, Latin Poetry (Lond.: 1895). / *C. T. CRUTTWELL, Hist. of Roman Lit. to the Death of M. Aurelius (6th ed. Lond.: 1898), — an admirable guide. / *J. W. MACKAIL, Latin Lit. (3d ed. Lond.: 1899). / M. PATIN, Études sur la poésie latine (4th ed. 2 vols. Paris: 1900). / H. E. BUTLER, Post-Augustan Poetry (Oxford: 1909), — Seneca to Juvenal. / H. N. FOWLER, Hist. of Roman Lit. (N.Y.: 1909). / F. PLESSIS, La poésie latine (Paris: 1909), — from Livius Andronicus to Rutilius Namatianus. / *J. W. DUFF, A Lit. Hist. of Rome from the Origins to the Close of the Golden Age (2d ed. Lond.: 1910). / E. NORDEN (in Bd. I, 1910, of Gercke and Norden as cited above, VI, B, 2d paragraph, under E. Bethe). / *J. E. SANDYS (ed.), A Companion to Latin Studies (Camb. Univ.: 1910), — a valuable, concise account of Roman culture in general; see Chap. VIII, Poetry, by A. W. Verrall and W. C. Summers. / ZOELLER-MARTINI, Grundriss der Gesch. der römischen Lit., — to the end of the 5th century (vol. I, 1910). / F. LEO (in Hinneberg's Kultur der Gegenwart, 3d ed. 1912). / R. PICHON, Hist. de la litt. latine (5th ed. Paris: 1912). / *M. S. DIMSDALE, Hist. of Latin Lit. (N.Y.: 1915).

C. *Periodicals.* See above, V, C.

XI. Latin Christian Poetry.

A. *Bibliography.* See J. A. FABRICIUS, Bibliotheca Latina Mediae et Infimae Aetatis, as noted above, X, A, I; the references above, V, A, 4; and the histories noted below, especially those of KRÜGER, MANITIUS, EBERT, GRÖBER, HARNACK, SCHANZ, and BÄHR.

B. *Histories.* For works by J. C. F. BÄHR (1836, 1872), *TEUFFEL (1870, 1910), BERNHARDY (1872), *SCHANZ (1890–1914), and NORDEN (1910), see above, X, B; for works by DONALDSON (1864), *EBERT (1874–1889), *MANITIUS (1891, 1911), CRUTTWELL (1893), *HARNACK (1893, 1897), *KRÜGER (1897), *BAUMGARTNER (1900), *TAYLOR (1901), BARDENHEWER (1902), *GRÖBER (1902), and *KER (1904), see above, § 12, IV; for *PAUL (1900), see above, § 5. See also P. MONCEAUX, Hist. litt. de l'Afrique chrétienne depuis les origines jusqu'à l'invasion arabe (4 vols. 1901–1912); *H. JORDAN, Gesch. der altchrist. Lit. (Leipz.: 1911).

C. *Periodicals.* See above, V, C; also *Texte und Untersuchungen zur Gesch. der altchrist. Lit.* (Leipz.: 1883 +).

XII. **Modern European Poetry and Comparative Literature.**

A. *Bibliography.*

1. *General.* See above, I; IV, A.

2. *To 1500.* For bibliographies of early printed books and incunabula see the references to Hain, Copinger, Reichling, Burger, Mattaire, Panzer, Pellechet, Proctor, Pollard, etc. in A. B. KROEGER'S Guide to the Study and Use of Reference Books (3d ed., by I. G. Mudge. Chicago: 1917. Pp. 175–176); or see R. A. PEDDIE'S *Fifteenth-Century Books, a Guide to their Identification (Lond.: 1913) and *Conspectus Incunabulorum, an Index Catalogue of Fifteenth-Century Books (2 pts. Lond.: 1910–1913).

3. *Since 1500.* See below, under the various European nations; also the periodicals mentioned under C, below, many of which contain valuable reviews. Particularly valuable for current bibliography and reviews of works (books, monographs, articles in periodicals, etc.) on Romance and Germanic philology and literature is the **Literaturblatt für germanische und romanische Philologie* (Leipz.: 1880 +).

4. *Comparative Literature.* J. BLANC, Bibliographie italico-française universelle, ou catalogue méthodique de tous les imprimés en langue fr. sur l'Italie ancienne et moderne, 1475–1885 (2 vols. 1886). / *L. P. BETZ, La littérature comparée, essai bibliographique (Strasbourg: 1900. 2d ed. by F. Baldensperger. 1904), — lists of critical and historical works on the literary interrelation of the chief modern European nations, including a section on Greek and Roman antiquity and the Orient as represented in the literatures of France, England, Germany, Italy, and Spain; arranged by nations and subjects. / *A. L. JELLINEK, Bibliographie der vergleichenden Literaturgeschichte (Berlin: 1903), — covers the year from the middle of 1902 to the middle of 1903; publication discontinued. / L. M. PRICE, English > German Literary Influences, Bibliography and Survey, Part I Bibliog. (in *Univ. of Calif. Pubs. Mod. Philol.*, 9: 1–111. Berkeley: 1919).

B. *Histories.*

1. *General.* *QUADRIO (1739–1752) and *SULZER-BLANKENBURG (1771–1774; 1796–1798), — noted above, § 2. / J. G. EICHHORN, Allgemeine Gesch. der Kultur und Lit. des neueren Europa (2 vols. 1796–1799). / *F. BOUTERWEK, Gesch. der Poesie und Beredsamkeit seit dem Ende des 13. Jahrh. (12 vols. Göttingen: 1801–1819; with a 13th vol. on Spanish lit., by E. Brinckmeier, 1850), — containing much independent research and dealing originally and suggestively with the prose both of knowledge and of power as well as with poetry. / J. C. L. SIMONDE DE SISMONDI, Hist. de la litt. du midi de l'Europe (4 vols. Paris: 1813; Eng. trans. by T. Roscoe, 2d ed., 2 vols., Bohn, 1846). / C. SCHLOSSER, Gesch. des 18. Jahrh. (Heidelberg: 1823; cf. his Weltgeschichte, Frankfurt: 1815–1824), — one of the first attempts to show the relation of literature to the development of institutions, customs, and ideas. / *H. HALLAM, Introd. to the Lit. of Europe in the 15th, 16th, and 17th Centuries (4 vols. 1837–1839), — one of the most successful attempts at a general history of literature. It must,

of course, be checked at every step by reference to the results of later research, but it is judicious in its interpretation of books and authors, showing little inclination to sweeping generalization. See the preface for an account of previous works of similar scope (Possevin 1593, Morhof 1688, André 1782–1799, etc.). / *H. HETTNER, Literaturgesch. des 18. Jahrh. (3 pts. in 5 vols. Braunschweig: 1856–1870; 4th, 5th, 6th eds., 1893–1912; Pt. I England, II France, III Germany), — an indispensable guide to the literary movements of the 18th century in relation to religious, philosophical, and political backgrounds. / *G. VOIGT, Die Wiederbelebung des klassischen Altertums oder das erste Jahrh. des Humanismus (1859; 3d ed., by M. Lehnert, 2 vols., 1893), — a standard work. / *G. BRANDES, Hauptströmungen der Lit. des 19. Jahrh. (Danish original, lectures at the Univ. of Copenhagen, 1871 +; German trans. by Strodtmann, 4 vols. 1872–1876; a later rev. ed. begun by Brandes as Die Lit. des 19. Jahrh. in ihren Hauptströmungen dargestellt, Leipz.: 1882–1891; Eng. trans., 6 vols., N.Y.: 1901–1905; vol. I Emigrant Lit., II Romantic School in Germany, III Reaction in France, IV Naturalism in England, V Romantic School in France, VI Young Germany), — a most spirited work, distinguished by a political and philosophical radicalism. / *A. EBERT, Allgemeine Gesch. der Lit. des Mittelalters im Abendlande bis zum Beginne des 11. Jahrh. (3 vols. Leipz.: 1874–1887; 2d ed., vol. I, 1889; French trans. by J. Aymeric, etc., 3 vols. Paris: 1883–1889), — a standard work, now supplemented and corrected by the works of Manitius, Krüger, and Gröber mentioned above, under XI, B. / J. DEMOGEOT, Hist. des litts. étrangères considérées dans leurs rapports avec le développement de la litt. française (2 vols. Paris: 1880), — on the influence of Italian, Spanish, English, and German literatures on the literature of France. / A. STERN, Gesch. der neueren Lit. (7 vols. Leipz.: 1882–1885), — from the 14th to the last quarter of the 19th century. / For other titles see GAYLEY and SCOTT, pp. 378–379.

The best conspectus in English is contained in the series, *Periods of European Lit., edited by G. Saintsbury (12 vols. N.Y.: 1897–1907), containing the following volumes: *The Dark Ages, by W. P. Ker (1904); *The Flourishing of Romance and the Rise of Allegory, by G. Saintsbury (1897); *The Fourteenth Century, by F. J. Snell (1899); *The Transition Period, by G. G. Smith (1900); *The Earlier Renaissance, by G. Saintsbury (1901); *The Later Renaissance, by D. Hannay (1898); *The First Half of the Seventeenth Century, by H. J. C. Grierson (1906); *The Augustan Ages, by O. Elton (1899); *The Mid-Eighteenth Century, by J. H. Millar (1902); *The Romantic Revolt, by C. E. Vaughan (1907); *The Romantic Triumph, by T. S. Omond (1900); *The Later Nineteenth Century, by G. Saintsbury (1907).

2. *Romance Literatures.* *G. KÖRTING, Encyklopädie und Methodologie der romanischen Philologie mit besonderer Berücksichtigung des franz. und ital. (4 pts. in 2. Heilbronn: 1884–1888). / *G. GRÖBER, Grundriss der romanischen Philologie (2 vols. in 4. Strassburg: 1888–1902), — authoritative, standard; with the most important bibliography.

For a suggestive essay see F. Loise, De l'influence de la civilisation sur la poésie; l'Italie et la France, précédées d'une étude sur la poésie en Europe dans les premiers siècles du christianisme et aux temps barbares (Bruxelles: 1862; in Mém. de l'Académie royale de Belgique, vol. XIV of the octavo collection; for other parts of the same work see above, IV, B, and below, XV, B).

3. _Germanic Literatures._ *H. Paul, Grundriss der germanischen Philologie (2 vols. Strassburg: 1891–1893; 2d ed. 3 vols. in 4. 1900–1909; 3d ed. 5 + vols. 1911 +,— not yet advanced to the sections on history of literatures; see vol. II of the 1st and 2d editions),— standard, authoritative, accurate; with bibliography.

C. _Periodicals and Series of Monographs._

1. _General._ *_Archiv für das Studium der neueren Sprachen und Literaturen_,— often cited as _Herrig's Archiv_ (Braunschweig: 1846 +). / *_Literaturblatt für germanische und romanische Philologie_ (Heilbronn: 1880 +), — reviews of books and articles. / *_Publications of the Modern Language Assoc. of America_ (Baltimore and Cambridge, Mass.: 1884 +). / *_Modern Language Notes_ (Baltimore: 1885 +). / *_Zeitschrift für vergleichende Litteraturgesch._ (1887–1910). / _Berliner Beiträge zur germanischen und romanischen Philologie_ (Berlin: 1893 +). / _Die neueren Sprachen_ (Marburg i. H.: 1894 +). / _Forschungen zur neueren Litteraturgesch._ (München, etc.: 1896 +). / _Studien zur vergleichenden Litteraturgesch._ (Berlin: 1901–1909). / *_Modern Philology_ (Chicago: 1903 +). / _Untersuchungen zur neueren Sprach- und Literaturgesch._ (Bern, Leipz.: 1903–1912). / _Breslauer Beiträge zur Literaturgesch._ (Leipz.: 1904 +). / *_Studi medievali_ (Torino: 1904 +). / *_Modern Language Review_ (Cambridge, Eng.: 1905 +). / *_Studi di filologia moderna_ (Catania: 1908 +). / *_Germanisch-romanische Monatsschrift_ (Heidelberg: 1909 +). / Consult also the references given above, IV, C, 3.

See also the publications in modern philology of many universities, such as Harvard (_Studies and Notes in Philol. and Lit._, 1892 +; _Studies in Comparative Lit._, 1910 +), Yale, the universities of Pennsylvania, Illinois, California, Wisconsin, Minnesota, Missouri, Colorado, North Carolina, etc.

2. _Romance Literatures._ _Revue des langues romanes_ (Montpellier: 1870 +), —much material on Provençal poetry. / *_Romania_ (Paris: 1872 +). / _Rivista di filologia romanza_ (Imola: 1872–1876), succeeded by _Giornale di filologia romanza_ (Roma, etc.: 1878–1882), succeeded by _Studj di filologia romanza_ (Roma, etc.: 1884–1903), succeeded by _Studj romanza_ (Roma: 1903 +). / _Romanische Studien_ (Strassburg: 1875–1895). / *_Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie_ (Halle: 1875 +), with bibliographical supplements of unequal value. / _Ausgaben und Abhandlungen aus dem Gebiete der romanischen Philologie_ (Marburg: 1882 +). / *_Romanische Forschungen_ (Erlangen: 1883 +). / *_Kritischer Jahresbericht über die Fortschritte der romanischen Philologie_ (München und Leipz.: 1892 +), bibliography and reviews. / _Gesellschaft für romanische Lit._ (Dresden: 1903 +). / *_Romanic Review_ (N. Y.: 1910 +),

covering the period to the end of the 16th century. / *Harvard Studies in Romance Languages* (Cambridge: 1915 +). / Also publications in Romance philology of other universities of America and Europe.

3. *Romance and English Literatures.* **Jahrbuch für romanische und englische Literatur* (Berlin: 1859–1876), — with bibliography and reviews. / **Münchener Beiträge zur romanischen und englischen Philologie* (Erlangen und Leipz.: 1890 +).

4. *Germanic Literatures.* **Quellen und Forschungen zur Sprach- und Culturgesch. der germanischen Völker* (Strassburg: 1874 +), — a series of monographs. / **Jahresberichte über die Erscheinungen auf dem Gebiete der germanischen Philologie* (Berlin, etc.: 1880 +), — an excellent bibliographical journal, with brief reviews of the more important works. / *Acta Germanica, Organ für deutsche Philologie* (Berlin: 1889 +), — a series of monographs. / **Journal of Germanic Philology* (Bloomington, Ind., U. S. A.: 1897 +; from Sept. 1903 under the title *Journal of English and Germanic Philology*). / **Palaestra, Untersuchungen und Texte aus der deutschen und englischen Philologie* (Berlin: 1898 +), — monographs. / *Teutonia, Arbeiten zur germanischen Philologie* (Königsberg i. Pr.: 1902 +). / **Revue germanique* (Paris: 1905 +).

See also the *Columbia University Germanic Studies* (N. Y.: 1902 +) and other similar publications of American and European universities.

XIII. French (including Provençal) Poetry.

A. *Bibliographies.*

1. *General.* For national bibliographies see PEDDIE, National Bibliographies, pp. 9–10; / *N. Y. State Library Bulletin 38*, "Selected National Bibliographies," pp. 26–30.

2. *Medieval.* G. BRUNET, La France litt. au 15ᵉ siècle, ou catalogue raisonné des ouvrages en tout genre imprimés en langue française jusqu'à l'an 1500 (Paris: 1865). / H. L. D. WARD, Catalogue of Romances in the Dept. of MSS. in the British Museum (3 vols. Lond.: 1883–1910). / G. RAYNAUD, Bibliographie des chansonniers français des XIIIᵉ et XIVᵉ siècles, comprenant la description de tous les manuscrits, la table des chansons classées par ordre alphabétique de rimes et la liste des trouvères (2 vols. Paris: 1884). / C. CHABANEAU, Les biographies des troubadours . . . et la liste alphabétique de tous les poètes ou auteurs provençaux dont les noms ont été conservés jusqu'à la fin du 15ᵉ siècle (new ed. Toulouse: 1885), — with bibliography. / C. WAHLUND, Livres provençaux rassemblés . . . et offerts à la Bibliothèque de l'Université d'Upsala (Upsala: 1892). / J. BÉDIER and M. ROQUES, Bibliographie des travaux de Gaston Paris (Paris: 1904). / *L. FOULET, Bibliography of Medieval French Lit. for College Libraries (Yale Univ. Press: 1915), — a compact, convenient guide.

3. *The 16th Century.* Les bibliothèques françoises de La Croix, Du Maine et de Du Verdier, Sieur de Vauprivas (new ed. by Rigoley de Juvigny.

6 vols. Paris: 1772–1773). / See also reference No. 53 in Lanson's Manuel. "The 16th century in France, as in nearly every other country, is the worst period for the bibliographer" (PEDDIE).

4. *The 16th and 17th Centuries.* C. SOREL, Bibliothèque française (1644; 2d ed. Paris: 1667), — titles, without dates.

5. *The 17th Century.* *F. LACHÈVRE, Bibliographie des recueils collectifs de poésies publiés de 1597 à 1700 (3 vols. and Suppl. Paris: 1901–1905). / See also Lanson, No. 56 and Suppl. 56.

6. *The 18th Century.* J. S. ERSCH, La France litt., 1771–1796 (3 vols. Hamburg: 1797–1798; with two supplements, carrying the bibliography to 1805). / J. M. QUÉRARD, La France litt. (10 vols. 1827–1839; Suppl., 2 vols. 1854–1864), — from the beginning of the 18th century to 1826.

7. *The 19th and 20th Centuries.* (a) *Retrospective.* J. M. QUÉRARD, MAURY, LOUANDRE, et BOURQUELOT, La litt. française contemporaine, 1827–1849 (6 vols. Paris: 1842–1857). / P. CHÉRON, Catalogue général de la librairie fr. au 19^e siècle, 1800–1855 (3 vols. Paris: 1856–1859), — includes works not given in Quérard or Lorenz; discontinued after the letter D. / *G. VICAIRE, Manuel de l'amateur de livres du 19^e siècle, 1801–1893 (7 vols. Paris: 1894–1910; a supplement, 1894–1900, and a subject index have been announced), — traverses approximately the same period as Lorenz, but gives more information about fewer titles. / A. LAPORTE, Bibliographie contemporaine, hist. litt. du 19^e siècle (6 vols. Paris: 1884–1889), — with special reference to rare books; arranged by authors and not carried beyond *Hat.* / H. LE SOUDIER, Bibliographie française (10 vols. 2d ed. Paris: 1900); *Deuxième série — especially valuable (vol. I, 1900–1904, Paris: 1908; vol. II, 1905–1909, Paris: 1911), — covers books and annuals; continued by the annual indexes of the Mémorial de la librairie française. / *E. BLANC and H. VAGANAY, Répertoire bibliographique des auteurs et des ouvrages contemp. de langue fr. ou latine, etc. (Paris: 1902). / *H. P. THIEME, Guide bibliographique de la litt. française de 1800 à 1906 (Paris: 1907), — an incomplete but valuable list of authors and first editions. Under each author is a list of references, — biographical, critical, etc.

For an attempt to arrange the poets of the 19th and 20th centuries by schools see a table prefixed to R. FEDERN'S Répertoire bibliographique de la litt. fr. des origines à 1911 (Leipz.: 1913).

(b) *Retrospective and Current.* *Bibliographie de la France, ou, journal général de l'imprimerie et de la librairie (Paris: 1811 +), — weekly notices of current publications, supplemented by annual indexes, alphabetical and analytical. / *O. LORENZ, Catalogue général de la librairie française depuis 1840 (25 + vols. Paris: 1867 +), — an inclusive list, published periodically, of current literature from 1840 on; a double arrangement by authors and subjects facilitates reference. / Bibliographie de Belgique (Bruxelles: 1876 +), — fortnightly notices of current publications; annual author and subject index. / Catalogue mensuel de la librairie française, 1876 + (Paris: 1876 +). / *Bibliothèque nationale, Bulletin mensuel des récentes publications françaises (since 1882). / Mémorial de la librairie française, 1910 + (Paris: 1910 +), — supplements Le Soudier, noted above, (a); weekly, with monthly and annual indexes.

See also the periodicals listed below, C, and in Lanson's Manuel (noted just below), Nos. 295–328, Suppl. No. 322.

8. *Belles-Lettres.* The student of literature, however, is largely independent of these general bibliographies because he has in *G. LANSON'S Manuel bibliographique de la litt. française moderne, 1500–1900 (5 vols. Paris: 1909–1914), a most admirable guide and repository. For general bibliographies, retrospective and current, see vol. I, pp. 4, 5 ff., 23 ff., and supplements in vol. V; for general histories and collections, I, 26 ff., 30 ff., and supplements in vol. V; for bibliography of special periods and movements, including histories, monographs, editions of writers, etc., see the rest of the work. No student of French literature can afford to neglect this most clear and satisfactory manual. / For earlier similar works, but far narrower in scope, see C. FRIESLAND, Wegweiser durch das dem Studium der franz. Sprache und Lit. dienende bibliog. Material (Göttingen: 1897); A. SCHULZE, Über einige Hilfsmittel franz. Bibliog. (in *Herrig's Archiv*, vol. 99. 1897); E. G. W. BRAUNHOLTZ, Books of Reference for Students and Teachers of French (Lond.: 1901). / See also the bibliographical notes in many of the histories of the literature, especially those of PETIT DE JULLEVILLE, WRIGHT, BRUNETIÈRE (Manuel), GRÖBER, and KÖRTING.

First editions: J. LE PETIT, Bibliographie des principales éditions originales des écrivains français du 15^e^ au 18^e^ siècle (Paris: 1888).

B. *Histories.*

1. *General.* *Hist. litt. de la France (1733 +; new ed., vols. I–XII edited by Paulin Paris, 34 + vols. Paris: 1865–1914 +), — begun by the Benedictines of Saint-Maur and continued by members of the Institut; the most extensive attempt at writing the history of French literature. The work begins with the Gauls before the Christian era; the 34th vol. brings the history into the 14th century. / *D. NISARD, Hist. de la litt. fr. (Paris: 1844–1861; 17th ed., 4 vols. 1883). / J. DEMOGEOT, Hist. de la litt. fr. (Paris: 1852; many later eds.; 28th ed. 1899). / H. VAN LAUN, Hist. of French Lit. (3 vols. N.Y.: 1876–1877). / *F. BRUNETIÈRE, Études critiques sur l'hist. de la litt. fr. (various vols., 1880–1907), — valuable studies in many fields. / *G. SAINTSBURY, Short Hist. of French Lit. (Oxford: 1882; 7th ed. 1917). / *V. ROSSEL, Hist. litt. de la Suisse romande des origines à nos jours (2 vols. Paris: 1889–1891). / P. GODET, Hist. litt. de la Suisse fr. (Paris: 1890). / E. LINTILHAC, Précis hist. et critique de la litt. fr. (2 vols. Paris: 1890), — convenient for ready reference and concise bibliographical information. / *G. LANSON, Hist. de la litt. fr. (1894, and many later eds.; 12th ed. Paris: 1912), — the best of the shorter histories. / *L. PETIT DE JULLEVILLE (editor), Hist. de la langue et de la litt. fr. (8 vols. Paris: 1896–1899), — a standard work, though the chapters, written by different authorities, are of unequal merit. / *E. DOWDEN, Hist. of French Lit.

(Lond.: 1897),—contains a short list (pp. 429–436) of monographs on the various types in French literature; furnishes an excellent introduction for the student whose acquaintance with French letters is slight. / *F. BRUNETIÈRE, Manuel de l'hist. de la litt. fr. (Paris: 1898; English trans. by R. Derechef, 1898),—with brief bibliographical footnotes that are very helpful; general arrangement somewhat difficult, but nevertheless one of the handiest of French handbooks on the subject. / R. DOUMIC, Hist. de la litt. fr. (16th ed. Paris: 1900; 26th ed. 1911),—clear and concise. / É. FAGUET, Hist. de la litt. fr. (6th ed. 2 vols. Paris: 1900; English trans., A Lit. Hist. of France, Lond.: 1907). / *H. SUCHIER and A. BIRCH-HIRSCHFELD, Gesch. der franz. Lit. (Leipz.: 1900; 2d ed. 2 vols. 1913). / G. PELLISSIER, Précis de l'hist. de la litt. fr. (Paris: 1902),—clear and concise. / *F. BRUNETIÈRE, Hist. de la litt. fr. classique, 1515–1830 (4 vols. Paris: 1904–1917),—"continued after the author's death by friends and pupils, the work being revised by M. Chérel under the supervision of René Doumic." / L. CLARETIE, Hist. de la litt. fr., 900–1900 (2d ed., etc. 5 vols. Paris: 1905–1912),—anecdotic and gossiping. / A. L. KONTA, Hist. of French Lit. (N. Y.: 1910),—divided according to types; readable and popular. / *C. H. C. WRIGHT, Hist. of French Lit. (1912),—a valuable handbook; with bibliographical appendix.

2. *Medieval.* J. J. AMPÈRE, Hist. litt. de la France avant le 12^{e} siècle (3 vols. Paris: 1839–1840; vols. I–II entitled Hist. litt. de la France avant Charlemagne; 3d ed. 1870). / J. V. LE CLERC and E. RENAUD, Hist. litt. de la France au 14^{e} siècle (2d ed. 2 vols. 1865). / W. BESANT, Studies in Early French Poetry (Lond.: 1868),—dealing in the main with the 15th century. / *K. BARTSCH, Grundriss zur Gesch. der provenzalischen Lit. (Elberfeld: 1872; new ed. in preparation). For other works on Provençal poetry, see above, p. 208 ff. / A. FRANKLIN, Dictionnaire des noms, surnoms et pseudonymes latins de l'hist. litt. du moyen âge, 1100 à 1530 (Paris: 1875). / M. C. AUBERTIN, Hist. de la langue et de la litt. fr. au moyen âge (1876. 2d ed. 2 vols. Paris: 1883). / *G. KÖRTING, Encyclopädie und Methodologie der romanischen Philologie (3 vols. and Supplement in 2 vols. Heilbronn: 1884–1888). / *G. PARIS, La poésie du moyen âge (2 vols. Paris: 1885–1895; vol. I, 5th ed.; II, 3d ed. 1903–1906),—miscellaneous essays. / *G. GRÖBER, Grundriss der romanischen Philologie (2 vols. Strassburg: 1888–1897; 2d ed. 1897–1906; see vol. II, pt. i, for Latin and French lit., by Gröber; vol. II, pt. ii, for Provençal lit., by A. Stimming),—an admirable foundation; bibliography. / *G. PARIS, Manuel, la litt. fr. au moyen âge, 11th to 14th century (Paris: 1888; 5th ed. 1914),—the best manual; extensive bibliography. / A. RESTORI, Letteratura provenzale (Milano: 1891),—small but good. / P. ALBERT, La litt. fr. des origines à la fin du 16^{e} siècle (8th ed. Paris: 1894). / G. PARIS, Medieval French Lit. (Temple Primers Series, Lond.: 1903),—a brief introductory sketch. / C. VORETZSCH, Einführung in das Studium der altfranz. Lit. (1905),—helpful. / P. A. BECKER, Grundriss der altfranz. Lit. (Heidelberg:

1907). / P. Meyer, Provençal Literature (in Encyc. Brit. 11th ed. 1910). / *G. Paris, Esquisse historique de la litt. fr. au moyen âge depuis les origines jusqu'à la fin du 15^{e} siècle (2d ed. Paris: 1913).

3. *The 16th Century.* E. Pasquier, Les recherches de la France (ed., A. Duchesne. 3 vols. Paris: 1619), — see Book VII (1611), and cf. Tilley 1: 300–301 (work cited below). / Abbé Goujet, Bibliothèque fr., ou l'hist. de la litt. fr. (18 vols. 1740–1756), — especially for 16th and 17th centuries. / *C.-A. Sainte-Beuve, Tableau hist. et critique de la poésie fr. et du théâtre fr. au 16^{e} siècle (2 vols. Paris: 1828; new ed. 1 vol. 1843, omitting the selection from Ronsard and adding a second part of eight separate studies; 2 vols. 1876; etc.), — see notice of this work above, p. 217. / P. Chasles, Études sur le 16^{e} siècle en France (Paris: 1848), — to be used with caution. / L. Feugère, Caractères et portraits litt. du 16^{e} siècle (new ed. 2 vols. Paris: 1859), — chiefly of prose writers; to be used cautiously, as also his Les femmes poètes au 16^{e} siècle (1860). / Saint-Marc Girardin, Tableau de la litt. fr. au 16^{e} siècle (Paris: 1862), — another work that should not be trusted. / *A. Darmesteter and A. Hatzfeld, Le 16^{e} siècle en France (Paris: 1878; 7th ed. *c.* 1901), — an admirable summary, but not up to date; arranged by types; quotations, bibliography. / *A. Birch-Hirschfeld, Gesch. der franz. Lit. seit Anfang des 16. Jahrh., Erstes Buch, Das Zeitalter Ludwig's XII und Franz's I (Stuttgart: 1889), — "thorough and sound, with full and accurate bibliography." / É. Faguet, Le 16^{e} siècle (Paris: 1894; 9th ed. 1898), — essays on chief writers. / *H. Morf, Gesch. der neueren franz. Lit., vol. I Renaissance (Strassburg: 1898), — excellent brief introduction; bibliography. / *F. Brunetière, Hist. de la litt. fr. classique, vol. I, in 3 pts., De Marot à Montaigne, 1515–1595 (Paris: 1904–1908). / *A. Tilley, The Lit. of the French Renaissance (2 vols. Cambridge: 1904), — very complete, helpful, and trustworthy. / *H. Guy, Hist. de la poésie fr. au 16^{e} siècle, vol. I L'école des rhétoriqueurs (Paris: 1910), — detailed, authoritative. / A. Lefranc, Grands écrivains fr. de la renaissance (Paris: 1914).

For detailed bibliography of origins of the Renaissance, of humanism, literary relations with Italy and other nations, authors, movements, and language, see G. Lanson's Manuel bibliog., 1: 53–238, 5: 1535–1561.

4. *The 17th Century.* F. Robiou, Essai sur l'hist. de la litt. et des mœurs pendant la première moitié du 17^{e} siècle (Paris: 1858). / J. Demogeot, Tableau de la litt. fr. au 17^{e} siècle, avant Corneille et Descartes (1859). / V. Fournel, La litt. indépendante, 17^{e} siècle (Paris: 1862). / F. Lotheissen, Gesch. der franz. Lit. im 17. Jahrh. (4 vols. Wien: 1878–1884). / É. Faguet, Les grands maîtres du 17^{e} siècle (Paris: 1885; later eds. with title Le 17^{e} siècle, études litt. 19th ed. 1898). / P. Albert, La litt. fr. au 17^{e} siècle (7th ed. Paris: 1886). / V. Cousin, La société fr. au 17^{e} siècle (6th ed. Paris: 1886), — brilliant, but not always trustworthy. / P. Janet, Les passions et les caractères dans la litt. au 17^{e} siècle (Paris: 1888). / T. F. Crane, La société fr. au 17^{e} siècle (N. Y.: 1889), with bibliography. /

PÈRE G. LONGHAYE, Hist. de la litt. fr. au 17^e^ siècle (4 vols. 1895–1896),—clerical point of view. / *A. TILLEY, From Montaigne to Molière, or the Preparation for the Classical Age of French Lit. (Lond.: 1908). / *F. BRUNETIÈRE, Hist. de la litt. fr. classique, vol. II (Paris: 1912). / H. BREMOND, Hist. litt. du sentiment religieux en France depuis la fin des guerres de religion jusqu'à nos jours, vol. I L'humanisme dévot 1580–1660, vol. II L'invasion mystique 1590–1620 (Paris: 1916).

5. *The 18th Century.* N. LEMOYNE, dit Desessarts, Les siècles litt. de la France, ou nouveau dict. hist., critique, et bibliog. de tous les écrivains fr., morts et vivants, jusqu'à la fin du 18^e^ siècle (7 vols. Paris: 1800–1803). / A. G. P. B. DE BARANTE, La litt. fr. pendant le 18^e^ siècle (Paris: 1809; 5th ed. 1832; English trans. Lond.: 1833). / A. F. VILLEMAIN, Tableau de la litt. fr. au 18^e^ siècle (4 vols. 1828). / A. R. VINET, Hist. de la litt. fr. au 18^e^ siècle (2 vols. Paris: 1853; English trans. by J. Bryce, Edinb.: 1854). / É. BERSOT, Études sur le 18^e^ siècle (2 vols. Paris: 1855). / H. HETTNER, as noted above, under XII, B, I (1856–1870; 6th improved ed. of the Gesch. der franz. Lit., 1912). / P. ALBERT, La litt. fr. au 18^e^ siècle (Paris: 1874; 8th ed. 1895). / E. M. CARO, La fin du 18^e^ siècle (2 vols. Paris: 1880). / É. FAGUET, Le 18^e^ siècle, études litt. (Paris: 1890; later eds.). / É. SCHERER, Études sur la litt. au 18^e^ siècle (Paris: 1891). / L. M. E. BERTRAND, La fin du classicisme, etc. (Paris: 1897). / *F. BRUNETIÈRE, Hist. de la litt. fr. classique, vol. III (Paris: 1912). / D. MORNET, Le romantisme en France au 18^e^ siècle (Paris: 1912).

6. *The 19th and 20th Centuries.* G. PLANCHE, Portraits litt. (2 vols. 1836, 1848), and other literary studies. / J. A. MICHIELS, Hist. des idées litt. en France au 19^e^ siècle (2 vols. Paris: 1842; 4th ed. 1863). / A. R. VINET, Études sur la litt. fr. au 19^e^ siècle (3 vols. Paris: 1849–1851). / A. F. NETTEMENT, Hist. de la litt. fr. sous la restauration (2 vols. Paris: 1853) et sous le gouvernement de juillet (2 vols. 1854). / E. DE MIRECOURT, Les contemporains (1854–1860, 100 pts.; 1862–1872, 140 pts.). / A. FERRARD DE PONTMARTIN, Causeries litt. (3 vols. 1854–1856), and other Causeries, etc., of various dates. / É. SCHERER, Études sur la litt. contemp. (10 vols. Paris: 1863–1895). / Recueil de rapports sur le progrès des lettres et des sciences en France, Rapport sur le progrès des lettres: Discours préliminaire, S. de Sacy; Romans, P. Féval; Poésie, T. Gautier; Théâtre, E. Thierry (Paris: 1868). / *G. BRANDES, as noted above, under XII, B, I (1871, etc.). / J. P. CHARPENTIER, La litt. fr. au 19^e^ siècle (Paris: 1875). / G. MERLET, Tableau de la litt. fr. de 1800 à 1815, etc. (3 pts. 1878–1883). / P. ALBERT, La litt. fr. au 19^e^ siècle (2 vols. Paris: 1882; etc.). / Célébrités contemp. (1882–1888, 42 pts.). / *J. LEMAÎTRE, Les contemporains (8 vols., various dates and eds., 1885+). / É. FAGUET, Études litt. sur le 19^e^ siècle (Paris: 1887; later eds.). / É. BIRÉ, Portraits litt. (Lyon: 1888), and other Portraits, Causeries, etc. / *G. PELLISSIER, Le mouvement litt. au 19^e^ siècle (Paris: 1889; 6th ed. 1900; English trans. by A. G. Brinton, N.Y.: 1897). / *M. ALBERT, Litt. fr. sous la révolution, l'empire et la

restauration, 1789–1830 (Paris: 1891; 4th ed. 1898), — crowned by the Academy. / D. NISARD, Essais sur l'école romantique (Paris: 1891). / R. DOUMIC, Portraits d'écrivains (Paris: 1892), and other studies. / G. LARROUMET, Études de litt. et d'art (4 series, 1893–1896), and other Études, Portraits, etc. / G. PELLISSIER, Essais de litt. contemp. (Paris: 1893), and Nouveaux essais, etc. (1895), and Études de litt. contemp. (2 vols. 1898–1901). / A. SYMONS, Symbolist Movement in Lit. (Lond.: 1899). / V. THOMPSON, French Portraits (Boston: 1900). / A. BEAUNIER, La poésie nouvelle (Paris: 1902). / J. ERNEST-CHARLES, La litt. fr. d'aujourd'hui (Paris: 1902), and other studies. / Les célébrités d'aujourd'hui (ed. by E. Sansot-Orlando, R. Le Brun, Ad. van Bever, Paris: 1903 +). / *C. MENDÈS, Sur le mouvement poétique fr. de 1867 à 1900 (Paris: 1903), — with bibliography. / R. CANAT, Une forme du mal du siècle, du sentiment de la solitude morale chez les romantiques et les parnassiens (Paris: 1904). / R. DE GOURMONT, Promenades litt. (5 vols. Paris: 1904–1913), and other studies. / G. PELLISSIER, Études de litt. et de morale contemp. (Paris: 1905). / *G. CASELLA and E. GAUBERT, La nouvelle litt., 1895–1905 (2d ed. Paris: 1906), — with bibliography. / P. LASSERRE, Le romantisme fr., etc. (new ed. Paris: 1908). / L. CLARETIE, Hist. de la litt. fr., vol. IV 19th century (1909), V 1900–1910 (1912), — gossipy. / C. LE GOFFIC, La litt. fr. au 19ᵉ siècle (Paris: 1910), — brief. / L. MAIGRON, Le romantisme et les mœurs, etc. (Paris: 1910). / R. CANAT, La renaissance de la Grèce antique, 1820–1850 (Paris: 1911). / L. MAIGRON, Le romantisme et la mode, etc. (Paris: 1911). / *F. STROWSKI, Tableau de la litt. fr. au 19ᵉ siècle (Paris: 1912). / A. HEUMANN, Le mouvement litt. belge d'expression fr. depuis 1880 (2d ed. Paris: 1913). / J. BITHELL, Contemp. Belgian Lit. (Lond.: 1915). / *A. LOWELL, Six French Poets (2d rev. ed. N.Y.: 1916), — with bibliography. / G. TOURQUET-MILNES, Some Modern Belgian Writers (Lond.: 1916). / *F. BRUNETIÈRE, Hist. de la litt. fr. classique, vol. IV (Paris: 1917).

Information may also be found in such biographical dictionaries as G. VAPERAU'S Dict. universel des contemporains (6th ed. Paris: 1893) and Dict. universel des littératures (2d ed. Paris: 1884); C. E. CURINIER'S Dict. national des contemporains (Paris: 1900).

C. *Periodicals.* **Zeitschrift für franz.* (*neufranz.* 1879–1888) *Sprache und Lit.* (Leipz.: 1879 +), — very important because of its complete, current bibliography. / *Franz. Studien* (Heilbronn: 1881–1889; Berlin: 1893–1897, Neue Folge), — linguistic studies for the most part. *Revue de philologie fr.* (Paris: 1887 +). / **Annales du midi, revue archéologique, historique, et philologique de la France méridionale* (Toulouse: 1888 +), — especially for Provençal lit. and bibliography. / **Revue d'hist. litt. de la France* (1894 +), — with bibliography. / *Revue de la renaissance* (Paris: 1901 +). / *Revue du 18ᵉ siècle* (Paris: 1913 +). / *Les annales romantiques, revue d'hist. du romantisme* (Paris: 1904 +), — with bibliography. / *Revue du 16ᵉ siècle*, formerly *Rev. des études rabelaisiennes* (Paris: 1913 +).

See also the French periodicals mentioned above, under IV, C, 3, (a); especially the **Journal des savants*, **Revue des deux mondes*, **Revue des cours et conférences*, and **Revue critique d'histoire et de litt.* / See also certain periodicals listed above, under XII, C, 2 and 3; especially **Romania*, **Romanische Forschungen*, **Romanic Review*, **Zeitschrift für roman. Philol.*, **Jahrb. für roman. und eng. Lit.*, and **Krit. Jahresbericht.*

XIV. Italian Poetry.

A. *Bibliography.*

1. *Bibliography of Bibliographies.* *G. OTTINI and G. FUMAGALLI, Bibliotheca Bibliographica Italica (vol. I Torino: 1889; vol. II, Supplemento 1895; further supplements 1895–1896, 1896–1899, 1900, 1902), — a list of bibliographies published in or relating to Italy. The student of literature will be especially interested in §§ XIV, XV, XVI, XXVI, XXVIII, XXXIII. With this should be used the appendix by C. Mazzi, Indicazioni di bibliografia italiana (Firenze: 1893).

2. *General.* For the period up to 1835 (see below, under 4, *Bibliog. italiana*) there is no satisfactory bibliography of works printed in all parts of Italy; but there are many *regional bibliographies, for which see Ottini and Fumagalli, § XVI Bibliografie regionali di scrittori italiani. In addition the following three works may be consulted: *G. M. MAZZUCHELLI, Gli scrittori d'Italia (2 vols. in 6 pts. Brescia: 1753–1763), — "This great work never advanced beyond the letter B, but for the letters A–B it is absolutely without compare. A biographical notice of each author is followed by a list of his works and their editions" (Peddie); / N. F. HAYM, Biblioteca italiana (2 vols. Milano: 1771–1773; 6th ed. 4 vols. 1803), — a classified catalogue — history, poetry, prose, arts, science — of the rarer books, with an author index; / B. GAMBA, Serie dei testi di lingua e di altre opere importanti nella ital. lett. scritte dal secolo 14 al 19 (1805. 4th ed. Venezia: 1839).

3. *Early Period to 18th Century.* F. ZAMBRINI, Le opere volgari a stampa dei secoli 13 e 14 indicate e descritte (4th ed. Bologna: 1884). / A. F. DONI, La libreria del Doni fiorentino divisa in tre trattati, etc. (new ed. Venezia: 1557), — containing both the first (1550) and second (1551) catalogues of Doni. / G. M. CRESCIMBENI, Istoria e commentarî della volgar poesia (6 vols. Venezia: 1730–1731). / *F. S. QUADRIO, Della storia e della ragione d' ogni poesia (7 vols. Bologna-Milano: 1739–1752), — see above, § 2. / G. MELZI and P. A. TOSI, Bibliografia dei romanzi di cavalleria italiani (Milano: 1865). For similar works see Ottini and Fumagalli, § XXVI, g. / L. BELLARDI, Biblioteca degli anni 1792 e 1793 (Torino: 1794), — the more important works only. / L. VICCHI, Quarto estratto del libro intitolato Vincenzo Monti, le lettere e la politica in Italia dal 1750 al 1830 (Fusignano, Ravenna: 1887), — see pp. 606–652. / For other works see Ottini and Fumagalli, especially § XVI.

4. *Nineteenth Century.* (a) *Retrospective.* **Bibliografia italiana*, Anno 1-10. N.S. Anno 1-2. 1835-1846. Issued monthly with an annual index, classified by subjects; continued into 1847. / Bibliografia d'Italia (3 vols. Firenze: 1867-1869). / *G. BERTOCCI, Repertorio bibliografico delle opere stampate in Italia nel secolo 19 (3 vols. Roma: 1876-1887). / *Catalogo collettivo della libreria ital., 1878-1891 (4 vols. Milano: 1878-1891). / U. HOEPLI, Scelta delle migliori opere della lett. ital. moderna (Milano: 1911). / U. HOEPLI, Catalogo completo delle edizioni Hoepli, 1871-1914 (Milano: 1914).

(b) *Retrospective and Current.* **Bibliografia italiana, giornale dell' Associazione tipografico-libraria ital.* (4 + vols. Firenze: 1870 +), — a continuation of the Bibliog. d'Italia (1867-1869), noted above. / **Biblioteca nazionale di Firenze, bollettino delle pubblicazioni ital. ricevute per diritto di stampa*, 1886 + (Firenze: 1886 +), — a monthly classified list, supplemented by an annual index of authors. / *Giornale della libreria, della tipografia e delle arti e industrie affini* (Milano: 1888 +). / *A. PAGLIANI, Catalogo generale della libreria ital. dall' anno 1847 (4 vols. Milano: 1901 +; vols. I-III, 1847-1899; vol. IV Supplemento, 1900-1910). For index of subjects see the Indice per materie (2 + vols. 1910 +). A very valuable work. / See also periodicals noted below.

5. *Belles-Lettres.* For brief manuals for the student of literature see *G. MAZZONI, Avviamento allo studio critico delle lettere italiane (2d rev. ed. Firenze: 1907); / *O. BACCI, Indagini e problemi di storia lett. ital. con notizie e norme bibliografiche (Livorno: 1910). / See also the histories of literature, especially those by D'ANCONA and BACCI (Manuale, etc.), FLAMINI (Compendio), ROSSI, TORRACA, CASINI (in Gröber), GASPARY (especially the English and Italian translations of the work), and the volumes of the Storia lett. d'Italia (Vallardi, Milano). / Help also may be had from E. M. OETTINGER, Bibliographie biographique universelle (Paris: 1866); / V. TURRI, Dizionario storico manuale della lett. ital., 1000-1900 (3d ed. Torino: 1905); / G. FINZI and L. VALMAGGI, Tavole storico-bibliografiche della lett. ital. (Torino: 1889).

B. *Histories.*

1. *General.* G. M. CRESCIMBENI, Istoria della volgar poesia (Roma: 1698; *3d enlarged ed., with commentary, 6 vols. Venezia: 1730-1731). / *F. S. QUADRIO, Della storia e della ragione d' ogni poesia (7 vols. Bologna-Milano: 1739-1752), — see above, § 2. / *G. TIRABOSCHI, Storia della lett. ital. (11 vols. Modena: 1772-1795; 16 vols. Milano: 1822-1826. In Collezione de' classici italiani, vols. 302-317), — dealing more with the history of various branches and schools of learning than with the literature itself; little literary criticism; continued by Lombardi. / G. B. CORNIANI, I secoli della lett. ital. dopo il suo risorgimento (9 vols. 1804-1813; rev. and enlarged ed., 8 vols. Torino: 1854-1856). / P. L. GINGUENÉ, Histoire litt. d'Italie (14 vols. Paris: 1811-1835; vols. X-XIV by Salfi), — "written from an 18th-century point of view now entirely antiquated"; but full of valuable information, especially as regards the work of minor authors. The history

is carried through the 16th century. / J. C. L. SIMONDE DE SISMONDI, Histoire de la litt. du midi de l'Europe (4 vols. Paris: 1813; Eng. trans. by T. Roscoe, 2d ed., 2 vols., Bohn, 1846), — famous but superseded. / G. MAFFEI, Storia della lett. ital. dall' origine della lingua fino al secolo 19 (3 vols. Milano: 1824; new ed. 1858). / E. RUTH, Gesch. der ital. Poesie (2 vols. Leipz.: 1844–1847). / P. EMILIANI GIUDICI, Storia della lett. ital. (1855; 6th ed. 2 vols. Firenze: 1896). / *L. SETTEMBRINI, Lezioni di lett. ital. (1866 +; 16th ed. 3 vols. Napoli: 1894), — one of the most enthusiastic of the smaller histories. / *F. DE SANCTIS, Storia della lett. ital. (2 vols. Napoli: 1870; new ed., by B. Croce, Bari: 1912), — one of the best of the briefer accounts. / *A. GASPARY, Gesch. der ital. Lit. (2 vols. Berlin und Strassburg: 1885–1888; Eng. trans. of the first 11 chaps., together with the author's additions to the Italian trans. (1887) and with supplementary bibliographical notes (1837–1899), by H. Oelsner, Hist. of Early Ital. Lit. to the Death of Dante, Lond.: 1901; Ital. trans., with additions and completer bibliographical notes, by N. Zingarelli and V. Rossi, 2 vols., Torino: 1887–1891), — a standard work of great value. / T. CASINI, Manuale di lett. ital. ad uso dei licei (4 pts. Firenze: 1886 +; 2d ed. 1891). / L. ÉTIENNE, Hist. de la litt. ital. (Paris: 1875; another ed. 1884), — an admirable short history. / *Storia lett. d' Italia (Vallardi, Milano: 1878 +), — an important series, the vols. of which are noted below in their proper places according to centuries. / *F. TORRACA, Manuale della lett. ital. (3 vols. 1886–1887; 7th ed. 3 vols. in 4. Firenze: 1914–1915), — an admirable edition for use in the schools. / C. FENINI, Lett. ital. (1889; 6th ed., rev. by V. Ferrari, 1908. Manuali Hoepli), — a small handbook, useful in gaining a first view. / *A. D' ANCONA and O. BACCI, Manuale della lett. ital. (5 vols. Firenze: 1892–1895; many editions of each vol.; new ed. 6 vols. Firenze: 1904–1909), — an anthology with most helpful biographical, critical, and bibliographical materials. Vol. VI (1909) contains notices of contemporary writers and a bibliog. supplement to the entire work. / F. J. SNELL, Primer of Italian Lit. (Oxford: 1893), — an English coup d'œil. / *T. CASINI, Gesch. der ital. Lit. (in Gröber's Grundriss, II. Bd. 3. Abt. 1896–1897. 1901) is the best-arranged and clearest short account. / *Storia lett. d' Italia scritta da una società di professori (9 vols. Vallardi, Milano: 1897 +), — vols. noted below. This series is modern, standard, authoritative, — the best for the advanced student. / *R. GARNETT, Hist. of Ital. Lit. (Lond.: 1898), — an admirable outline, the best in English; far more readable and suggestive than most brief literary histories. / E. MESTICA, Compendio storico della lett. ital. (1898–1901; 2d ed. 3 vols. Livorno: 1904 +), — for schools. / [A. SOLERTI], Indice analitico della storia della lett. ital. (Firenze: 1898). / G. GIANNINI, Tavole sinottiche per lo studio della storia lett. d' Italia (Livorno: 1899). / F. TRAIL, A Hist. of Ital. Lit. (2 vols. in 1. N. Y.: 1903–1904), — superficial. / W. EVERETT, The Ital. Poets since Dante, Lowell Institute Lectures, 1904 (N. Y.: 1904). / *B. WIESE and E. PÈRCOPO, Storia della lett. ital. (Torino: 1904; German ed. Leipz.: 1899), — illustrated. / E. BOGHEN-CONIGLIANI, Storia della lett. ital. (3 vols. Firenze: 1905), — another school history. / F. FLAMINI, A Hist. of Ital. Lit., 1265–1907, trans. by E. M. O'Connor (limited ed. de luxe, The National Alumni. N.Y.: *c.* 1906). / *H. HAUVETTE, Litt. ital. (Paris: 1906; 2d ed. 1910), — brief, admirable. / *V. ROSSI, Storia della lett. ital. per uso dei licei (3 vols. Milano: 1907; 4th ed. 1911), — among the best of its kind. / *F. FLAMINI, Compendio di storia della lett. ital. (12th ed. Livorno: 1914), — for ready reference and first aid bibliographical, the best one-volume history.

2. *Through the 14th Century.* *A. BARTOLI, Storia della lett. ital. (7 vols. in 8. Firenze: 1878–1889), — authoritative; based on careful, extensive research. / A. GASPARY, Die sicilianische Dichterschule des 13. Jahrh. (Berlin: 1878; Ital. trans., with additions, by S. Friedmann, La scuola poetica siciliana del secolo 13, Livorno: 1882). / A. BARTOLI, I primi due secoli (Vallardi, Milano: 1880). / E. CELESIA, Storia della lett. in Italia ne' secoli barbari (2 vols. Genova: 1882). / A. D' ANCONA, Studi sulla lett. ital. de' primi secoli (Ancona: 1884). / U. RONCA, Cultura medioevale e poesia latina d' Italia nei secoli 11 e 12 (Memoria premiata dalla R. Accad. dei Lincei. 2 vols. Roma: 1892), — bibliog., 2: 103 ff. / G. A. CESÀREO, La poesia siciliana sotto gli Svevi (Catania: 1894). / *G. VOLPI, Il trecento (Storia lett. d' Italia. Vallardi, Milano: 1897–1898). / *N. ZINGARELLI, Dante (Storia lett. d' Ital. Vallardi, Milano: 1899–1904). / A. SOLERTI, Vite di Dante, Petrarca, e Boccaccio (Storia lett. d' Ital. Vallardi, Milano: 1904–1905). / G. MAZZONI, Esercitazioni sulla lett. religiosa in Ital. nei secoli 13 e 14 (Firenze: 1905). / *G. BERTONI, Il duecento (Storia lett. d' Ital. Vallardi, Milano: 1911). / *G. BERTONI, I trovatori d' Ital., biografie, testi, traduzioni, note (Modena: 1915. 608 pp.), — a valuable work that should have been noted above, p. 227.

3. *The 15th Century.* *J. A. SYMONDS, Renaissance in Italy, especially vols. IV, V (5 vols. Lond.: 1875–1881; new ed. Lond.: 1902). / *G. INVERNIZZI, Il risorgimento (Vallardi, Milano: 1878). / *G. KÖRTING, Gesch. der Lit. Italiens im Zeitalter der Renaissance (3 vols. Leipz.: 1878–1884; vol. II Boccaccio, III Anfänge d. Ren.-Lit.). / *V. ROSSI, Il quattrocento (Storia lett. d' Italia, Vallardi, Milano: 1897–1898). / *P. MOUNIER, Le quattrocento, essai sur l'hist. litt. du 15^e siècle italien (2 vols. Paris: 1901; new ed. 1908), — an admirable work, crowned by the French Academy; excellent account of interrelation of literature and social conditions; bibliography. / I. G. ISOLA, Critica del rinascimento (2 vols. Livorno: 1907). / C. HARE (Mrs. Marian Andrews), Life and Letters in the Italian Renaissance (N.Y.: 1915).

4. *The 16th Century.* *U. A. CANELLO, Lett. ital. nel secolo 16 (Vallardi, Milano: 1881). / *F. FLAMINI, Il cinquecento (Storia lett. d' Ital., Vallardi, Milano: 1898–1902).

5. *The 17th Century.* *M. MORSOLIN, Il seicento (Vallardi, Milano: 1880). / *A. BELLONI, Il seicento (Storia lett. d' Ital., Vallardi, Milano: 1898–1899).

6. *The 18th Century.* C. UGONI, Della lett. ital. nella seconda metà del secolo 18 (3 vols. Brescia: 1820–1822; new ed. 1856–1858). / A. LOMBARDI, Storia della lett. ital. nel secolo 18 (4 vols. Modena: 1827–1830). / G. GUERZONI, Il terzo rinascimento (Palermo: 1874; 3d ed. Verona: 1888). / *V. LEE (Violet Paget), Studies of the 18th Century in Italy (Lond.: 1880; 2d ed. 1907), — "now a recognized text-book in Italy." / *G. ZANELLA, Storia della lett. ital. dalla metà del settecento ai giorni nostri (Vallardi, Milano: 1880), — briefer ed. of the same, Della lett. ital. nell' ultimo secolo (Città di Castello: 1886). / *T. CONCARI, Il settecento (Storia lett. d' Ital., Vallardi, Milano: 1898–1900). / *M. LANDAU, Gesch. der ital. Lit. im 18. Jahrh. (Berlin: 1899). / P. HAZARD, La révolution française et les lettres ital., 1789–1815 (Paris: 1910).

7. *The 19th Century.* A. LEVATI, Saggio sulla storia della lett. ital. nei primi 25 anni del secolo 19 (Milano: 1831). / *A. ROUX, Hist. de la litt. ital. contemporaine, 1800–1850 (Paris: 1870). / F. DE SANCTIS, La lett. ital. nel secolo 19 (from lectures delivered 1872–1876; Napoli: 1902). / A. ROUX, Hist. de la litt. contemp. en Italie sous le régime unitaire, 1859–1874 (Paris: 1874). / G. BARZELLOTTI, La rivoluzione e la lett. in Italia avanti e dopo gli anni 1848 e 1849 (Firenze: 1875). / *G. ZANELLA, as noted above, under 6 (1880). / *G. MESTICA, Manuale della lett. ital. nel secolo 19 (2 vols. in 3. Firenze: 1882–1887). / A. ROUX, La litt. contemp. en Italie, 3^{e} période, 1873–1883 (Paris: 1883). / *W. D. HOWELLS, Modern Italian Poets (N. Y.: 1887). / A. ROUX, La litt. contemp. en Italie, dernière période, 1883–1896 (Paris: 1896). / *G. MAZZONI, L' ottocento (Storia lett. d' Ital., Vallardi, Milano: 1898–1913), — the chief work on the period. / J. DORNIS (Mme. G. Beer), La poésie ital. contemp. (Paris: 1898). / M. MURET, La litt. ital. d'aujourd'hui (Paris: 1906). / A. REGGIO, L'Italie intellectuelle et litt. au début du 19^{e} siècle (Paris: 1907). / *L. COLLISON-MORLEY, Modern Italian Lit. (Lond.: 1911). / V. FERRARI, Lett. ital. moderna e contemporanea, 1748–1911 (Manuali Hoepli, 3d ed. 1911), — a brief introduction. / P. MONTI, Lett. ital., moderna e contemp., appunti critico-polemici (Brescia: 1911). / D. MANTOVANI, Lett. contemp. (1913). / See also articles, with valuable bibliography, by B. CROCE in *La critica*; also the collection I contemporanei (Perrella, Napoli). / For dictionaries of biography, see A. DE GUBERNATIS, Dictionnaire international des écrivains du jour (new ed. Rome: 1905; Supplément, 1906), and Dizionario biografico degli scrittori contemp. (Firenze: 1879).

C. *Periodicals.* **Il propugnatore* (Bologna: 1868–1886; new series 1887–1893). / **Giornale storico della lett. ital.* (Torino: 1883 +). / *Rivista critica della lett. ital.* (Firenze, Roma: 1884–1892). / *Bullettino della società dantesca ital.* (Firenze: 1890–1892; 2d series, 1893 +). / *Giornale dantesco* (continuation of *L'Alighieri*, 1890–1892. Firenze: 1893 +). / **Rassegna bibliografica della lett. ital.* (Pisa: 1893 +). / **Rassegna critica della lett. ital.* (Napoli: 1896 +), — especially valuable book-reviews. / **Rivista d' Italia* (Roma: 1897 +). / **Bulletin italien* (Bordeaux: 1901 +). / **La critica, rivista di* *lett., storia e filosofia* (Croce, Napoli: 1903 +). / See also the following series of monographs: F. Torraca's Biblioteca critica della lett. ital. (Firenze: 1895–1903); / E. Pèrcopo's Studi di lett. ital. (Napoli: 1899 +); / B. Croce's Studi di lett., storia e filosofia.

XV. Spanish (including Catalan) Poetry.

A. *Bibliography.*

1. *General.* J. P. FUSTER, Biblioteca valenciana de los escritores que florecieron hasta nuestros días (2 vols. Valencia: 1827–1830), — a regional bibliography; for many others, some of them very important, see Elías de Molíns, as noted below, under 5. / *D. HIDALGO, Diccionario general de bibliografía española (7 vols. Madrid: 1862–1881), — author and subject indexes in the last two vols. / B. J. GALLARDO, Ensayo de una biblioteca española de libros raros y curiosos (4 vols. Madrid: 1863–1889). / P. SALVÁ Y MALLEN, Catálogo de la biblioteca de Salvá (2 vols. Valencia: 1872). / J. L. WHITNEY, Catalogue of the Spanish Library and of the Portuguese Books bequeathed by George Ticknor to the Boston Public Library, etc. (Boston Pub. Libr.: 1879). / D. GARCIA PÉRES, Catálogo razonado biográfico y bibliográfico de los autores *portugueses* que escribieron en castellano (Madrid: 1890). / R. HEREDIA, Catalogue de la bibliothèque de M. Ricardo Heredia (4 vols. Paris: 1891–1894), — includes the Salvá catalogue, but is classified more minutely. / M. MENÉNDEZ Y PELAYO, Bibliografía hispano-latina clássica, etc. (vol. I, Madrid: 1902; in Biblioteca de la revista de archivos, bibliotecas y museos), — a list of classical studies, editions of the classics, and monographs on classical influences.

2. *Through the 15th Century.* M. ANTONIO, Bibliotheca Hispana Vetus, sive, Hispani Scriptores qui ab Octaviani Augusti Aevo ad Annum . . . 1500 floruerunt (2 vols. Matriti: 1788). / *K. HAEBLER, Bibliografía ibérica del siglo 15 (La Haya: 1903; Segunda Parte, supplement to the 1903 ed., Leipz.: 1917), — an author catalogue, with index of printers, of all books known to have been printed in Spain and Portugal during the 15th century.

3. *The 16th and 17th Centuries.* M. ANTONIO, Bibliotheca Hispana Nova, sive, Hispanorum Scriptorum qui ab Anno 1500 ad 1684 floruere Notitia (2d enlarged ed. 2 vols. Matriti: 1783–1788). / C. PÉREZ PASTOR, Bibliografía madrileña, 1566–1625 (3 vols. Madrid: 1891–1907). See similar works for Medina del Campo (1895) and Toledo (1887); and for other regions, as noted by Elías de Molíns (work cited below, under 5). A late work of this sort is J. M. SÁNCHEZ, Bibliografía aragonesa del siglo 15 (2 vols. Madrid: 1913–1914). / See further in Gallardo, Salvá, Heredia, and Whitney, as noted above, under 1.

4. *The 18th and 19th Centuries.* (a) *Retrospective.* See Hidalgo and Whitney, as already noted, under 1. / *J. P. CRIADO Y DOMINGUEZ, Literatas españolas del siglo 19, apuntes bibliográficos (Madrid: 1889), — helpful classified lists. / A. ELÍAS DE MOLÍNS, Diccionario biográfico y bibliográfico de escritores y artistas catalanes del siglo 19 (2 vols. Barcelona: 1889–1895).

/ Also the following periodicals: *El bibliógrafo español y estranjero* (Madrid: 1843–1850), succeeded by *Boletín bibliográfico español* (9 vols. Madrid: 1861–1869); / *Boletín de la librería* (Madrid: 1874–1909).

(b) *Retrospective and Current. Revista de bibliografía catalana* (Barcelona: 1901 +); / **Bibliografía española* (Madrid: 1902 +), — fortnightly; / **Archivo bibliográfico hispano-americano* (Madrid: 1909 +); / *Anuario de la librería española, portuguesa é hispano-americana* (Madrid: 1912 +). / For other bibliographical periodicals of the 18th and 19th centuries, see Elías de Molíns, 1: 143–148, of the work noted below; see also the periodicals noted below, under C.

5. *Belles-Lettres.* *A. ELÍAS DE MOLÍNS, Ensayo de una bibliografía literaria de España y América, noticias de obras y estudios relacionados con la poesía, teatro, historia, novela, crítica literaria, etc. (2 vols. in 1. Madrid: 1902; also in *Revista crítica de hist. y lit.*, etc., vols. V–VII, 1900–1902), — a small but helpful work. / W. HANSSLER, Handy Bibliographical Guide to the Study of the Spanish Language and Lit. (St. Louis, Mo.: *c.* 1915), — of no aid to the advanced student. / Literary histories by the following are rich in bibliography: Fitzmaurice-Kelly (very helpful; the 1916 Spanish ed. is superior in bibliog. to earlier English, French, and Spanish eds.), Körting, Baist, Michaëlis de Vasconcellos and Braga, Cejador y Franca (extensive).

B. *Histories.*

1. *General.* F. BOUTERWEK (see vol. III, 1804, of the work cited above, under XII, B, 1; English trans. by T. Ross, Hist. of Spanish and Portuguese Lit., 2 vols., Lond.: 1823 and later eds.; Spanish trans., Madrid: 1829). / *G. TICKNOR, Hist. of Spanish Lit. (3 vols. Boston: 1849; 4th ed., enlarged and rev., Boston: *c.* 1891; French trans. by J.-G. Magnabal, 3 vols., Paris: 1864–1872; Spanish trans., with additions, 4 vols., Madrid: 1851–1856), — antiquated, but still valuable. / J. VALERA Y ALCALÁ GALIANO, Crítica literaria, essays published 1854–1905, 15 vols. (Obras completas, Madrid: 1908–1912, vols. XIX–XXXIII), — many valuable studies of various aspects of Spanish lit. / F. LOISE, Hist. de la poésie en rapport avec la civilisation; la poésie espagnole (Bruxelles: 1868; in Mém. pub. par l'Académie royale, vol. XX of the octavo collection). / *E. BARET, Hist. de la litt. espagnole (Paris: 1884), — a good handbook. / G. KÖRTING, Encyklopädie und Methodologie der roman. Philol. (4 pts. in 2. Heilbronn: 1884–1888; for histories of Catalan and Spanish lit. see 3: 542–547). / A. MOREL-FATIO, Études sur l'Espagne (3 vols. Paris: 1888–1904). / H. B. CLARKE, Spanish Lit., an Elementary Handbook (Lond.: 1893; 2d ed. 1909), — useful. / V. M. O. DENK, Einführung in die Gesch. der altcatalanischen Lit. von deren Anfängen bis zum 18. Jahrh. (München: 1893). / M. MENÉNDEZ Y PELAYO, Estudios de crítica lit. (5 vols. Madrid: 1893–1908). / *J. FITZMAURICE-KELLY, A Hist. of Spanish Lit. (Lond.: 1898; Spanish trans., Madrid: 1901, 2d ed. 1916, — the best; French trans., 2d ed., Paris: 1913), — the chief short account; excellent bibliography

in the 1916 Spanish ed. / R. BEER, Span. Literaturgesch. (Sammlung Göschen. 2 vols. Leipz.: 1903), — brief conspectus. / *P. A. BECKER, Gesch. der span. Lit. (Strassburg: 1904), — brief but helpful. / B. SANVISENTI, Manuale di lett. spagnuola (Milano: 1907), — a good handbook. / *E. MÉRIMÉE, Précis d'hist. de la litt. espagnole (Paris: 1908), — another helpful handbook. / *J. CEJADOR Y FRANCA, Hist. de la lengua y lit. castellana, etc. (vols. I–IX Madrid: 1915–1918; other vols. announced; vol. IX covers the period 1870–1887), — most complete and authoritative; includes Spanish-American authors; excellent bibliog. / A. SALCEDO Y RUIZ, La lit. española, resumen de historia crítica (2d enlarged ed. 3 vols. Madrid: 1915–1916), — popular.

2. *Through the 15th Century.* L. CLARUS (W. Volk), Darstellung der span. Lit. im Mittelalter (2 vols. Mainz: 1846), — antiquated; use with caution. / *F. J. WOLF, Studien zur Gesch. der span. und portug. Nationallit. (Berlin: 1859; Spanish trans., with additions and notes, by M. de Unamuno, Hist. de las lits. castellana y portuguesa, 2 vols., Madrid: 1895–1896), — still valuable, especially in the Spanish ed. / *J. AMADOR DE LOS RÍOS, Hist. crítica de la lit. española, to 1500 (7 vols. Madrid: 1861–1865), — use with caution. / COMTE TH. DE PUYMAIGRE, Les vieux auteurs castillans, hist. de l'ancienne litt. espagnole (1861–1862; 2d ed., incomplete, Paris: 1888–1890). / V. BALAGUER, Hist. política y lit. de los trovadores (6 vols. Madrid: 1878–1879; 2d ed. 1882–1883; vols. III–VI of Obras), — should have been cited above, p. 250. / COMTE TH. DE PUYMAIGRE, La cour litt. de Don Juan II, 1419–1454 (2 vols. Paris: 1893). / *G. BAIST, Spanische Lit. (in Gröber's Grundriss, 2. Bd. 2. Abt. 1897; cited above, XII, B, 2), — to end of 16th century. / *A. MOREL-FATIO, Katalanische Lit. (also in Gröber), — only a brief notice of works later than the 16th century. / E. DE LA BARRA, Lit. arcaica, estudios críticos (Valparaiso: 1898). / J. FITZMAURICE-KELLY, Chapters on Spanish Lit. (Lond.: 1908). / *M. MENÉNDEZ Y PELAYO, Hist. de la poesía castellana en la edad media (2 vols. Madrid: 1911–1913; vol. IV of Obras completas). / *E. CARRÉ ALDAO, Influencias de la lit. gallega en la castellana, estudios críticos y bibliográficos (Madrid: 1915), — useful, especially for the troubadour lyric; bibliography. / C. R. POST, Mediaeval Spanish Allegory (*Harvard Studies in Comp. Lit.*, vol. IV. 1915).

3. *The 16th and 17th Centuries.* P. CHASLES, La France, l'Espagne et l'Italie au 17^e siècle (Paris: 1877). / *A. MOREL-FATIO, L'Espagne au 16^e et 17^e siècle (Heilbronn: 1878). / *D. HANNAY, The Later Renaissance (N.Y.: 1898). / A. SCHNEIDER, Spaniens Anteil an der deutschen Lit. des 16. und 17. Jahrh. (Strassburg: 1898). / B. DE LOS RÍOS DE LAMPÉREZ, Del siglo de oro, etc. (Madrid: 1910). / See also some of the works listed above, under 2, especially those by Baist, Morel-Fatio, and Carré Aldao.

4. *The 18th Century.* *L. A. DE CUETO, MARQUÉS DE VALMAR, Hist. crít. de la poesía castellana en el siglo 18 (3d rev. ed. 3 vols. Madrid: 1893). / V. CIAN, Italia e Spagna nel secolo 18 (Torino: 1896). / *E. COTARELO Y MORI, Iriarte y su época (Madrid: 1897).

5. *The 19th Century.* G. DIERCKS, Das moderne Geistesleben Spaniens (Leipz.: 1883). / R. FERNÁNDEZ VILLAVERDE Y GARCÍA DEL RIVERO, La escuela didáctica y la poesía política en Castilla durante el siglo 19 (Madrid: 1902). / P. GENER, Cosas de España (Barcelona: 1903), — Catalan renascence, etc. / J. LEÓN PAGANO, Al través de la España lit. (2 vols. 3d ed. Barcelona: 1904), — brief papers on modern writers. / E. PIÑEYRO, El romanticismo en España (Paris: 1904). / J. M. AICARDO, S.J., De lit. contemporánea, 1901–1905 (2d enlarged ed. Madrid: 1905), — includes notices of Catalan and Spanish-American writers. / *F. BLANCO GARCÍA, La lit. española en el siglo 19 (3d ed. 2 vols. Madrid: 1909–1910). / R. CANSINOS ASSENS, La nueva lit., 1898–1916 (2 vols. Madrid: 1917).

C. *Periodicals.* For bibliography of Spanish periodicals, see above, IV, C, 2. The most important journal is the **Revue hispanique* (Paris: 1894 +), devoted to Spanish, Catalan, and Portuguese history and literature. / See also *Memorias de la Academia española* (Madrid: 1870 +); / *Revista contemporánea* (Madrid: 1875 +); / **Bulletin hispanique* (Bordeaux: 1899 +); / *Revista española de lit., hist. y arte* (1901 +); / *Cultura española* (Madrid: 1906 +); / *Revista de filología española* (1914 +).

XV *a*. **Spanish-American Poetry.**

For bibliography and literary histories, see A. L. COESTER, A Bibliog. of Spanish-American Lit. (N.Y.: 1912; *Romanic Rev.*, vol. III, No. 1); also the same writer's The Lit. Hist. of Spanish America (N.Y.: 1916), which contains useful bibliog. notes. For national bibliographies see Kroeger, p. 177 (note the work by J. B. Kaiser); Peddie, pp. 1, 2, 4, 5, 8, 24; N.Y. State Library Bulletin 38, p. 38. The works of Kroeger and Peddie and Bulletin 38 are cited above, I, A.

XVI. **Portuguese Poetry.**

A. *Bibliography.* For national bibliographies see R. A. Peddie, National Bibliographies (Lond.: 1912), pp. 26–27; N.Y. State Library Bulletin 38, Selected National Bibliogs. (Albany: 1915), p. 38. For Portuguese authors who wrote in Spanish see D. Garcia Péres, noted above, XV, A, 1. For select bibliography of belles-lettres, literary histories, monographs, etc., see the works of Gröber, Körting, and Prestage, as noted below.

B. *Histories.*

1. *General.* F. BOUTERWEK (1805), as cited above, XV, B, 1. / SISMONDI (1813. Vol. IV, pp. 260–562), as cited, with other works which may be consulted, above, XII, B, 1. / F. J. WOLF (1859), as cited above, XV, B, 2. / *T. BRAGA, Hist. da poesia portugueza (4 vols. Porto: 1871–1872); Hist. da litt. portugueza (2 vols. 1909–1914). Braga's works are the most extensive and, though they are marred by crotchet and caprice and must be used with care, yet they are a monument of earnest and patriotic endeavor. / *G. KÖRTING (1884–1888), as cited above, XII, B, 2; helpful bibliographical notes. / *T. BRAGA, Curso da hist. da litt. portugueza

(Lisboa: 1885), — a school text, but a valuable survey. / *A. LOISEAU, Hist. de la litt. portugaise (Paris: 1886). / C. VON REINHARDSTOETTNER, Zur lit. Gesch. Portugals, in Aufsätze und Abhandlungen, vornehmlich zur Litgesch. (Berlin: 1887). / *C. MICHAËLIS DE VASCONCELLOS and T. BRAGA, Gesch. der portugiesischen Lit., in Gröber's Grundriss (Bd. II, Abt. II. 1897), as cited above, XII, B, 2. This is the best, most authoritative work; valuable bibliography. See also Michaëlis de Vasconcellos' article, Portugal, Littérature, in La grande encyclopédie. / MENDES DOS REMEDIOS, Hist. da litt. portugueza desde as origenes até a actualidade (3d ed. Coimbra: 1908). / *E. PRESTAGE, Article, Port. Lit., in Encyc. Brit., 11th ed. (1911). / J. DE BARROS, La litt. portugaise, esquisse de son évolution (Porto: 1910). / *A. F. G. BELL, Studies in Port. Lit. (Oxford: 1914), — sympathetic, informing; bibliography.

2. *The 19th and 20th Centuries.* LOPES DE MENDONÇA, Memorias da litt. contemporanea (1855). / A. R. ORTIZ, La lit. portuguesa en el siglo 19 (Madrid: 1870). / *M. BARRETO, Litt. portugueza contemporanea (in *Revista de Portugal*, July 1889). / *T. BRAGA, As modernas ideias na litt. portugueza (2 vols. Porto: 1892). / M. FORMONT, Le mouvement poétique contemporain en Portugal (in *Revue du siècle*, 1892). / P. LEBESQUE, Le Portugal litt. d'aujourd'hui (Paris: 1904). / *E. PRESTAGE, Port. Lit. of the 19th Cent. (Chap. VI in G. Saintsbury's The Later 19th Cent. Lond.: 1907). / F. DE FIGUEIREDO, Hist. da litt. romantica portugueza, 1825–1870 (Lisboa: 1913).

C. *Periodicals. Revista litteraria*, etc. (Porto: 1838–1843). / *Revista portugueza* (Porto: 1894 +).

XVII. **English Poetry.**

A. *Bibliography.*

1. *General.* R. WATT, Bibliotheca Britannica, or a General Index to British and Foreign Lit. (4 vols. Edinb.: 1824). / W. T. LOWNDES, Bibliographers' Manual of English Lit., containing an account of rare, curious, and useful books, etc. (1834. New ed., rev. and enlarged. 6 vols. Lond.: 1885). / J. P. COLLIER, Bibliographical and Critical Account of the Rarest Books in the English Language (4 vols. N.Y.: 1866). / W. C. HAZLITT, Handbook to the Popular, Poetical, and Dramatic Lit. of Great Britain, from the Invention of Printing to the Restoration (Lond.: 1867); by the same, Bibliographical Collections and Notes on Early English Lit., 1474–1700 (6 vols. Lond.: 1876–1903). With these may be used G. J. Gray's General Index to Hazlitt's Handbook and his Bibliog. Collections (Lond.: 1893). / S. A. ALLIBONE, Critical Dictionary of English Lit. and British and American Authors . . . from the earliest account to the latter half of the 19th century (3 vols. Philadelphia: 1899); Supplement, by J. F. Kirk (2 vols. Philadelphia: 1899). / A. GROWOLL, Three Centuries of English Book-Trade Bibliography, 1595 + (N.Y. Dibdin Club: 1903), containing a list of catalogues published 1595–1902, by W. Eames.

2. *Middle English.* *J. E. WELLS, A Manual of the Writings in Middle English 1050–1400 (Yale Univ. Press: 1916).

3. *15th Century.* W. BLADES, The Biography and Typography of William Caxton (2d ed. Lond.: 1882). / S. DE RICCI, A Census of Caxtons (Lond.: 1909), description of all known copies. / E. G. DUFF, Fifteenth Century English Books, a Bibliography, etc. (Oxford Univ. Press: 1917).

4. *1475–1640.* C. SAYLE, Early English Printed Books in the University Library of Cambridge, 1475–1640 (4 vols. Camb.: 1900–1907).

5. *1501–1556.* *E. G. DUFF and Others, Handlists of Books printed by London Printers, 1501–1556 (Lond. Bibliog. Soc.: 1913), lists of books from eighty-nine printers, up to the granting of a charter, 1557, to the Stationers' Company.

6. *1554–1640.* *Stationers' Company, Transcript of the Registers of the Company of Stationers of the City of London, 1554–1640, ed. by E. Arber (5 vols. 1875–1877; Birmingham: 1894).

7. *To 1640.* *British Museum Library, Catalogue of Books in the Library printed in England, Scotland, and Ireland, and of Books in English printed Abroad to 1640 (3 vols. Lond.: 1884). / John Rylands Library, Catalogue of Books in the John Rylands Library, Manchester, printed in England, Scotland, and Ireland, and of Books in English printed Abroad to the End of the Year 1640 (Manchester: 1895).

8. *1640–1661.* *British Museum Library, Catalogue of the Pamphlets, Books, Newspapers, and Manuscripts relating to the Civil War, the Commonwealth, and Restoration, collected by George Thomason, 1640–1661, ed. by G. K. Fortescue (2 vols. Lond.: 1908).

9. *1640–1708.* *Stationers' Company, Transcript of the Registers of the Worshipful Company of Stationers, 1640–1708, ed. by G. E. B. Eyre, transcribed by H. R. Plomer (3 vols. Lond.: 1913–1914).

10. *1668–1709.* *E. ARBER, The Term Catalogues, 1668–1709 (3 vols. Lond.: 1903–1906), including the Easter Term of 1911; a collation of the very rare published lists of books for each law term.

11. *1700–1786.* W. BENT, A General Catalogue of Books in all Languages, Arts, and Sciences, printed in Great Britain and published in London, 1700–1786 (Lond.: 1786); for the last years of the 18th century, W. Bent, The London Catalogue of Books, corrected to August, 1811 (Lond.: 1811). These quite unsatisfactory works are the only ones of their kind for the 18th century. / See also the lists of new books printed in each number of the *Gentleman's Magazine*, the *London Magazine*, etc.

12. *1801 to date.* *English Catalogue of Books. For the period 1801–1836 see R. A. PEDDIE and Q. WADDINGTON, The English Cat. of Books, 1801–1836 (Lond.: 1914), which supersedes the London Catalogues for the period edited by W. Bent (Lond.: 1831) and T. Hodgson (Lond.: 1846). The years 1835–1915 are covered in nine volumes, listing hundreds of thousands of books; from vol. 5 on the Catalogue contains authors and subjects in one alphabetical list; for subject index to the first four vols.

use the Index to the English Cat. of Books (4 vols. Lond.: 1858–1893). Continued as an annual catalogue, with appendixes giving the publications of learned societies.

13. *Current.* *English Catalogue of Books, annual, as noted above. / *The Bookseller* (1858 to date), a monthly record of British and foreign literature. / **Publishers' Circular and Booksellers' Record of British and Foreign Lit.* (1837 to date), weekly trade journal,—the basis of the annual English Catalogue.

14. *Belles-Lettres.* There is no adequate, separate handbook like G. Lanson's Manuel bibliographique for French literature, but the bibliographical appendixes of the Cambridge Hist. of Lit. are extensive and well selected. Körting's Grundriss der Gesch. der eng. Lit. (5th ed.) is helpful as a partial record of scholarship up to 1910. For the Anglo-Saxon period Wülker's Grundriss was authoritative up to the year 1885; it must now be checked with later works.

15. *For Irish, Scottish, and Welsh literature*, see below, XX, A; XXI, A; XXII, A.

16. *Canadian.* For national bibliographies see R. A. Peddie, National Bibliographies (Lond.: 1912), p. 3; N.Y. State Library Bulletin 38, Selected National Bibliogs. (Albany: 1915), p. 24. See also A. MacMurchy, A Handbook of Canadian Lit. (Toronto: 1906).

17. *Australasian.* See Peddie, pp. 1, 23; H. G. Turner and A. Sutherland, The Development of Australian Lit. (Lond.: 1898).

18. *Anglo-Indian.* E. F. Oaten, A Sketch of Anglo-Indian Lit. (Lond.: 1908).

B. *Histories.*

1. *General.* H. A. TAINE, Hist. de la litt. anglaise (4 vols. Paris: 1863–1864; 8th enlarged ed. 1892; English trans. by H. Van Laun, 2 vols. N. Y.: 1871, and later editions). This famous work is subjective in attack, arbitrary in method (application of preconceived ideas of literary growth), and for the earlier periods worthless from the scientific point of view; but it is eminently readable and, for the mature student who can check the author's slips and vagaries, deeply suggestive. / *G. KÖRTING, Grundriss der Gesch. der eng. Lit. (Münster i. W.: 1887; 5th rev. ed. 1910),—a very convenient survey, with valuable critical paraphernalia. / *H. MORLEY, English Writers (11 vols. Lond.: 1887–1895),—extensive, detailed, scholarly; much bibliography. The last volume, completed by W. H. Griffin, treats of the age of James I. / *J. J. JUSSERAND, Hist. litt. du peuple anglais (2 vols. Paris: 1894, etc.; English trans., A Lit. Hist. of the English People, 3 vols. N. Y.: 1895–1909). / *W. J. COURTHOPE, A Hist. of English Poetry (6 vols. Lond.: 1895–1910),—a valuable work which has aroused much criticism. / *R. P. WÜLKER, Gesch. der eng. Lit. (Leipz.: 1896; 2d rev. ed. 2 vols. 1906–1907). / *R. GARNETT and E. W. GOSSE, English Lit., An Illustrated Record (4 vols. Lond.: 1903). / *The Cambridge Hist. of English Lit., ed. by A. W. Ward and A. R. Waller (14 vols.

Lond.: 1907–1917),—with extensive bibliographical appendixes. This is the most considerable and serious effort to construct an adequate history, but the chapters, by different writers, are of very unequal value. / W. R. NICOLL and T. SECCOMBE, A Hist. of English Lit. (3 vols. N.Y.: 1907). / *J. W. MACKAIL, The Springs of Helicon, A Study in the Progress of English Poetry from Chaucer to Milton (Lond.: 1909). / E. DE SÉLINCOURT, English Poets and the National Ideal (Lond.: 1915).

Of the many smaller manuals the following may be mentioned: *S. A. BROOKE, English Lit. (Lond.: 1876, and later eds.; new ed., rev. and corrected, with appendix on American lit., by J. H. Patton, N.Y.: 1882, and later eds.),—one of the best of the briefer handbooks. / H. MORLEY, A First Sketch of English Lit. (Lond.: 1892; new, enlarged ed. 1912). / *E. W. GOSSE, A Short Hist. of Modern English Lit. (Lond.: 1897; Short Hists. of Lits. of the World Series). / F. S. CORBETT, A Hist. of British Poetry (Lond.: 1904). / *W. V. MOODY and R. M. LOVETT, A Hist. of English Lit. (N.Y.: 1907). / H. S. PANCOAST, An Introd. to English Lit. (3d enlarged ed. N.Y.: 1907). / W. H. CRAWSHAW, The Making of English Lit. (Boston: 1907, etc.). / *W. J. LONG, English Lit. (Boston: *c.* 1909),—a convenient textbook. / A. LANG, Hist. of English Lit. (2d rev. ed. N.Y.: 1912).

See also *English Men of Letters, ed. by J. Morley (38 vols. Lond.: 1884–1911); / F. RYLAND, Chronological Outlines of English Lit. (Lond.: 1890, etc.); / T. J. TUCKER, The Foreign Debt of English Lit. (Lond.: 1907).

2. *To the Age of Elizabeth.* T. WARTON, Hist. of English Poetry from the 12th to the Close of the 16th Century (Lond.: 1774; ed. W. C. Hazlitt, 4 vols., Lond.: 1871). / E. KÖLBING, Beiträge zur vergleichenden Gesch. der romantischen Poesie und Prosa des Mittelalters, unter besonderer Berücksichtigung der englischen und nordischen Lit. (Breslau: 1876). / *B. TEN BRINK, Gesch. der eng. Lit. (2 vols. Berlin: 1877; English trans. by H. M. Kennedy, 1883, and later as 2 vols. in 3, N.Y.: 1889–1896),—to the death of Surrey. Still a highly valuable work, but it must be checked with later investigations. / *R. P. WÜLKER, Grundriss zur Gesch. der angelsächsischen Lit. (Leipz.: 1885),—with bibliography of the older critical material. / *S. A. BROOKE, Hist. of Early English Lit. (Lond.: 1892). / *B. TEN BRINK, Altenglische Lit. (in Paul's Grundriss, 1st ed., vol. II, 1893). / C. M. LEWIS, The Beginnings of English Lit. (Boston: 1901),—a brief but spirited textbook. / *F. J. SNELL, The Age of Chaucer (Lond.: 1901) and The Age of Transition, 1400–1580 (Lond.: 1905). / *W. H. SCHOFIELD, English Lit. from the Norman Conquest to Chaucer (N.Y.: 1906),—standard, authoritative; bibliography. / *A. BRANDL, Altenglische Lit., and Mitteleng. Lit., both in Paul's Grundriss (vol. II, 1893; 2d ed. 1908), cited above, XII, B, 3,—authoritative, scientific; bibliography. / F. J. SNELL, The Age of Alfred, 664–1154 (Lond.: 1912). / W. P. KER, English Lit., Medieval (Lond.: 1912. Home University Library, No. 45). / G. SARRAZIN, Von Kädmon bis Kynewulf (Berlin: 1913). / C. S. BALDWIN,

Introd. to English Medieval Lit. (N.Y.: 1914), Beowulf to Chaucer. / *J. E. WELLS, Manual of the Writings in Middle English 1050–1400 (1916).

3. *Age of Elizabeth to the 18th Century.* E. P. WHIPPLE, Lit. of the Age of Elizabeth (Boston: 1869). / *E. W. GOSSE, Seventeenth Century Studies (Lond.: 1883; 2d rev. ed. 1885) and From Shakespeare to Pope, an inquiry into the causes and phenomena of the rise of classical poetry in England (Camb.: 1885). / C. H. HERFORD, Studies in the Lit. Relations of England and Germany in the 16th Century (Camb.: 1886). / *G. E. B. SAINTSBURY, A Hist. of Elizabethan Lit. (Lond.: 1887, and later eds.). / E. W. GOSSE, The Jacobean Poets (N.Y.: 1894). / R. GARNETT, The Age of Dryden (Lond.: 1895). / J. H. B. MASTERMAN, The Age of Milton (Lond.: 1897). / J. G. UNDERHILL, Spanish Lit. in the England of the Tudors (N.Y.: 1899), — with bibliography. / T. SECCOMBE and J. W. ALLEN, The Age of Shakespeare, 1579–1631 (2 vols. Lond.: 1903). / B. WENDELL, The Temper of the 17th Century in English Lit. (1904). / A. H. UPHAM, The French Influence in English Lit. from the Accession of Elizabeth to the Restoration (N.Y.: 1908), — with bibliography. / *S. LEE, The French Renaissance in England (N.Y.: 1910), — with bibliography. / *F. E. SCHELLING, English Lit. during the Lifetime of Shakespeare (N.Y.: 1910), — with bibliography. / J. M. ROBERTSON, Elizabethan Lit. (N.Y.: 1914. Home University Library, No. 89). / G. WATERHOUSE, The Lit. Relations of England and Germany in the 17th Century (Camb.: 1914), — with bibliography.

4. *The 18th Century.* J. NICHOLS, Illustrations of the Lit. Hist. of the 18th Century (8 vols. Lond.: 1817–1858). / *H. HETTNER, Gesch. der eng. Lit., 1660–1770, being Th. I of his Litgesch. des 18. Jahrh. (1856–1870; 6th rev. ed. Braunschweig: 1912). / *SIR LESLIE STEPHEN, Hist. of English Thought in the 18th Century (2 vols. Lond.: 1876; 3d ed. 1902). / *A. BELJAME, Le public et les hommes de lettres en Angleterre au 18^e siècle, 1660–1744 (Paris: 1881). / M. O. OLIPHANT, The Lit. Hist. of England in the End of the 18th and the Beginning of the 19th Century (3 vols. Lond.: 1882). / T. S. PERRY, English Lit. in the 18th Century (N.Y.: 1883). / *E. W. GOSSE, A Hist. of 18th Century Lit., 1660–1780 (Lond.: 1889), — with bibliography. / W. L. PHELPS, The Beginnings of the English Romantic Movement (Boston: 1893). / J. DENNIS, The Age of Pope (Lond.: 1894). / E. DOWDEN, The French Revolution and English Lit. (Lond.: 1897). / *H. A. BEERS, A Hist. of English Romanticism in the 18th Century (N.Y.: 1899), — with bibliography. / T. SECCOMBE, The Age of Johnson, 1748–1798 (Lond.: 1900). / *SIR LESLIE STEPHEN, English Literature and Society in the 18th Century (Lond.: 1904). / *C. CESTRE, La révolution française et les poètes anglais, 1789–1809 (Paris: 1906). / T. E. CASSON, 18th Century Lit. (Oxford: 1909). / C. B. TINKER, The Salon and English Letters, etc. (N.Y.: 1915). / G. E. B. SAINTSBURY, The Peace of the Augustans, etc. (Lond.: 1916).

5. *The 19th and 20th Centuries.* *G. BRANDES, Main Currents in 19th Cent. Lit. (Danish original, 1871 +), as cited above, XII, B, I. / H. B.

FORMAN, Our Living Poets (Lond.: 1871). / W. J. COURTHOPE, The Liberal Movement in English Lit. (Lond.: 1885). / G. SARRAZIN, Renaissance de la poésie anglaise, 1798–1889 (Paris: 1889). / M. O. and F. R. OLIPHANT, Victorian Age of English Lit. (2 vols. Lond.: 1892). / W. R. NICOLL and T. J. WISE, Lit. Anecdotes of the 19th Century (2 vols. Lond.: 1895–1896). / H. WALKER, The Greater Victorian Poets (Lond.: 1895) and The Age of Tennyson (Lond.: 1897). / *H. A. BEERS, A Hist. of English Romanticism in the 19th Century (N.Y.: 1901), — with bibliography. / C. H. HERFORD, The Age of Wordsworth (Lond.: 1901). / W. ARCHER, Poets of the Younger Generation (Lond.: 1902). / *E. C. STEDMAN, Victorian Poets (Lond.: 1876; rev. and enlarged ed. Boston: *c.* 1903), — a spirited and scholarly work. / *G. E. B. SAINTSBURY, A Hist. of 19th Century Lit., 1780–1895 (Lond.: 1904). / W. M. PAYNE, The Greater English Poets of the 19th Century (N.Y.: 1907). / A. SYMONS, The Romantic Movement in English Poetry (N.Y.: 1909). / L. MAGNUS, English Lit. in the 19th Century (Lond.: 1909). / *H. WALKER, The Lit. of the Victorian Era (Camb.: 1910), — valuable; also his Outlines of Victorian Lit. (1913). / H. RICHTER, Gesch. der eng. Romantik (2 vols. Halle a. S.: 1911). / *O. ELTON, A Survey of English Lit., 1780–1830 (2 vols. Lond.: 1912), — on an extended scale. / J. M. KENNEDY, English Lit. 1880–1905 (1912). / G. K. CHESTERTON, The Victorian Age in Lit. (Lond.: 1913. Home University Library), — brief, stimulating, clever. / H. JACKSON, The Eighteen Nineties (1913). / M. C. STURGEON, Studies of Contemporary Poets (1916). / H. WILLIAMS, Modern English Writers (1918). / *J. W. CUNLIFFE, English Lit. during the last Half-Century (N.Y.: 1919).

6. *For Irish and Scottish Poetry* see below, XX, XXI.

C. *Periodicals and Series of Monographs. Deutsche Shakespeare-Gesellschaft, Jahrbuch* (Berlin, Weimar: 1865+). / *Englische Studien* (Heilbronn: 1877+). / **Anglia, Zeitschr. für englische Philologie* (Halle a. S.: 1878+). / **Anglia Beiblatt, Mitteilungen aus dem gesammten Gebiete der englischen Sprache und Lit.* (Halle a. S.: 1890+), — reviews, current bibliography. / *Erlanger Beirtäge zur englischen Philologie* (Erlangen und Leipz.: 1889–1904). / *Wiener Beiträge zur englischen Philologie* (Wien und Leipz.: 1895+). / *Studien zur englischen Philologie* (Halle a. S.: 1897+). / *Bonner Beiträge zur Anglistik* (Bonn: 1898–1908), continued as *Bonner Studien zur englischen Philologie* (1909+). / *Anglistische Forschungen* (Heidelberg: 1901+). / *Hesperia, Schriften zur englischen Philologie* (Göttingen: 1913+).

See also the English series of various European, English, and American universities; also above, IV, C; XII, C.

XVIII. American (United States) Poetry.

A. *Bibliography.* For general bibliographies see KROEGER (cited above, I, A), pp. 177–180; / PEDDIE (also above, I, A), pp. 32–33; / N.Y. State Library Bulletin 38 (also above, I, A), pp. 14–18. For bibliography of belles-lettres in particular and of literary histories, monographs, etc. see the Cambridge Hist. of American Lit., now in course of publication (noted below).

B. *Histories*. *M. C. TYLER, Hist. of Am. Lit., 1607–1765 (2 vols. N.Y.: 1878). / *E. C. STEDMAN, Poets of America (Boston: 1885). / C. F. RICHARDSON, Am. Lit. (2 vols. N.Y.: 1887). / H. A. BEERS, Initial Studies in Am. Letters (N.Y.: 1895). / J. B. MATTHEWS, Introd. to the Study of Am. Lit. (N.Y.: 1896). / *M. C. TYLER, The Lit. Hist. of the Am. Revolution, 1763–1783 (2 vols. N.Y.: 1897). / H. S. PANCOAST, Introd. to Am. Lit. (N.Y.: 1898; 2d rev. ed. *c.* 1912). / K. L. BATES, Am. Lit. (N.Y.: 1898). / W. C. BRONSON, A Short Hist. of Am. Lit. (Boston: 1900). / *A. G. NEWCOMER, Am. Lit. (Chicago: *c.* 1901). / J. L. ONDERDONK, Hist. of Am. Verse, 1610–1897 (Chicago: 1901). / *B. WENDELL, A Lit. Hist. of America (N.Y.: 1901), — with bibliography. / R. BURTON, Lit. Leaders of America (N.Y.: 1902). / W. C. LAWTON, Introd. to the Study of Am. Lit. (N.Y.: 1902). / J. W. ABERNETHY, Am. Lit. (N.Y.: 1903). / T. W. HIGGINSON and H. W. BOYNTON, A Reader's Hist. of Am. Lit. (Boston: 1903). / *W. P. TRENT, A Hist. of Am. Lit., 1607–1865 (N.Y.: 1903. Short Hists. of the Lits. of the World Series). / G. E. WOODBERRY, America in Lit. (N.Y.: 1903). / L. SEARS, Am. Lit. in the Colonial and National Periods (2d ed. Boston: 1905). / C. HOLLIDAY, A Hist. of Southern Lit. (Washington: 1906). / J. B. RITTENHOUSE, The Younger American Poets (Boston: 1906). / E. W. BOWEN, Makers of Am. Lit. (N.Y.: 1908). / M. J. MOSES, The Lit. of the South (N.Y.: 1910). / R. P. HALLECK, Hist. of Am. Lit. (N.Y.: 1911). / F. V. N. PAINTER, Introd. to Am. Lit. (rev. ed. Boston: 1911). / W. B. CAIRNS, A Hist. of Am. Lit. (N.Y.: 1912). / B. PERRY, The American Mind (Boston: 1912). / C. A. SMITH, Die amerikanische Lit. (Berlin: 1912), — with bibliography. / W. P. TRENT and JOHN ERSKINE, Great Writers of America (N.Y.: 1912). / F. L. PATTEE, A Hist. of Am. Lit. since 1870 (N.Y.: 1915). / *The Cambridge Hist. of Am. Lit., ed. by W. P. Trent, J. Erskine, S. P. Sherman, C. van Doren (2 + vols. N.Y.: 1917–1919 +), — the only extensive and the most authoritative history; with bibliography.

See also English Men of Letters, American Series (28 vols. N.Y.: 1902–1911).

XIX. **Celtic Poetry in General.**

A. *Histories and Essays*. E. RENAN, Poetry of the Celtic Races (in *Rev. des deux mondes*, 1854; English trans. by W. G. Hutchinson, Lond.: 1896). / M. ARNOLD, The Study of Celtic Lit. (Lond.: 1867). / *H. D'ARBOIS DE JUBAINVILLE, Cours de litt. celtique (12 vols. Paris: 1883–1902). / SIR J. RHYS, Celtic Heathendom (Hibbert Lects., 1886. Lond.: 1888). / *M. MACLEAN, The Lit. of the Celts (Lond.: 1902). / *H. ZIMMER, Sprache und Lit. der Kelten im Allgemeinen (in Hinneberg's Kultur der Gegenwart, T. I, Abt. XI, 1. Berlin: 1909).

B. *Periodicals*. **Revue celtique* (Paris: 1870 +). / *The Celtic Magazine* (Inverness: 1875–1888), merged into the *Scottish Highlander*, — popular. / *The Scottish Celtic Review* (Glasgow: 1881–1885). / *The Gaelic Journal*

(1 vol. Dublin: 1882–1883). / **Zeitschr. für celtische Philologie* (Halle a. S.: 1897+). / **The Celtic Review* (Edinb.: 1904+). / **Ériu*, Journal of the School of Irish Learning, Dublin (Dublin: 1904+). / *Gadelica*, A Journal of Modern Irish Studies (Dublin: 1912).

See also *Trans. of the Gaelic Soc. of Dublin* (vol. I, Dublin: 1808); / *Trans. of the Ossianic Soc.*, 1853–1858 (6 vols. Dublin: 1854–1861); / *Trans. of the Gaelic Soc. of Inverness* (Inverness: 1872+); / **Pubs., Irish Texts Soc.* (Lond.: 1899+); / *Pubs., Univ. of Manchester*, Celtic Series (1909+).

XX. Irish (including Irish-English) Poetry.

A. *Bibliography*. For many Irish writers see the bibliographies cited above, XVII, A; from KROEGER, pp. 180–181, and PEDDIE, p. 20 (works cited above, I, A), the following are taken.

Catalogue of Books printed in Ireland and published in Dublin from 1700 (Dublin: 1791), — very rare; a copy in the library of Trinity College, Dublin. / *H. D'ARBOIS DE JUBAINVILLE, Essai d'un catalogue de la litt. épique de l'Irlande (Paris: 1883). / E. R. M. DIX, Catalogue of Early Dublin Printed Books, 1601–1700 (4 vols. in 2. Dublin: 1898–1905). / S. J. Brown, A Guide to Books on Ireland (Dublin: 1912). / *National Library, Dublin, Bibliog. of Irish Philol. and of Printed Irish Lit. (Dublin: 1913). See also the histories that follow.

Very helpful is D. J. O'DONOGHUE'S The Poets of Ireland, a Biographical and Bibliographical Dictionary of Irish Writers of English Verse (Dublin and Lond.: 1912).

B. *Histories*. SIR JAMES WARE, The Writers of Ireland (1746). / E. O'REILLY, A Chronological Account of Nearly 400 Irish Writers (Dublin: 1820; Trans. of Iberno-Celtic Soc.). / E. O'CURRY, Lects. on the Manuscript Materials of Ancient Irish Hist. (Dublin: 1861) and On the Manners and Customs of the Ancient Irish (3 vols. Lond.: 1873). / *H. MORLEY, English Writers, vol. I (1866–1867), — on the ancient literature of the Gael and Cymry; bibliography. / D. HYDE, The Story of Early Gaelic Lit. (Lond.: 1895) and *A Lit. Hist. of Ireland from Earliest Times to the Present Day (Lond.: 1899). / G. DOTTIN, La litt. gaélique de l'Irlande (in *Rev. de synthèse historique*, 3: 60–97. Paris: 1901). / D. HYDE, Irish Poetry (Dublin: 1902). / LADY GREGORY, Poets and Dreamers, Studies and Translations from the Irish (Dublin: 1903). / *E. HULL, A Text Book of Irish Lit. (2 vols. Dublin: 1906–1908). / *K. MEYER, Die irisch-gälische Lit. (in Hinneberg's Kultur der Gegenwart, T. I, Abt. XI, 1. Berlin: 1909). / C. M. FOX, Annals of the Irish Harpers (N.Y.: 1912). / A. P. GRAVES, Irish Lit. and Musical Studies (Lond.: 1913).

C. *Some Works on Recent Irish Literature*. M. MONOHAN, Nova Hibernia, Irish Poets and Dramatists of To-day and Yesterday (N.Y.: 1914). / E. A. BOYD, Ireland's Lit. Renaissance (N.Y.: 1916). / T. MACDONAGH, Lit. in Ireland (N.Y.: 1916). / L. R. MORRIS, The Celtic Dawn, A Survey of the Renaissance in Ireland, 1889–1916 (N.Y.: 1917).

XXI. Scottish and Manx Poetry.

A. *Scottish* (*including Scottish-English Writers*).

1. *Bibliography.* For many Scottish writers see the bibliographies cited above, XVII, A; from KROEGER, p. 181, and PEDDIE, p. 28 (works cited above, I, A), the following are taken.

H. G. ALDIS, A List of Books printed in Scotland before 1700, etc. (Edinb.: 1904). / *D. MACLEAN, Typographia Scoto-gadelica, or Books printed in the Gaelic of Scotland, 1567–1914 (Edinb.: 1915). See also the histories that follow.

2. *Histories.* T. MACLAUCHLAN, Celtic Gleanings, or Notices of the Hist. and Lit. of the Scottish Gael (Edinb.: 1857). / J. S. BLACKIE, The Lang. and Lit. of the Scottish Highlands (Edinb.: 1876). / J. M. ROSS, Scottish Hist. and Lit. to the Period of the Reformation (1884). / N. MACNEILL, The Lit. of the Highlanders, A Hist. of Gaelic Lit. from the Earliest Times to the Present Day (Inverness: 1892). / *H. WALKER, Three Centuries of Scottish Lit. (2 vols. Glasgow: 1893). / *T. F. HENDERSON, Scottish Vernacular Lit. (Lond.: 1898; 3d rev. ed. Edinb.: 1910). / H. G. GRAHAM, Scottish Men of Letters in the 18th Century (Lond.: 1901). / *J. H. MILLER, Lit. Hist. of Scotland (Lond.: 1903). / G. DOTTIN, La litt. gaélique de l'Écosse (in *Rev. de synthèse historique*, 8: 78–90. Paris: 1904). / M. MACLEAN, The Lit. of the Highlands (Lond.: 1904). / *L. C. STERN, Die schottisch-gälische und die manx Lit. (in Hinneberg's Kultur der Gegenwart, T. I, Abt. XI, 1. Berlin: 1909). / D. MACLEAN, The Lit. of the Scottish Gael (Edinb.: 1912).

B. *Manx.*

Histories. H. JENNER, The Manx Lang., its Grammar, Lit., and Present State (*Philol. Soc. Trans.*, 1875). / A. W. MOORE, A Hist. of the Isle of Man (Lond.: 1900). / G. DOTTIN, as cited under A, 2, above. / *L. C. STERN, as cited above.

XXII. Welsh (including Welsh-English) Poetry.

A. *Bibliography.* For many Welsh writers see the bibliographies cited above, XVII, A. / W. ROWLANDS, Cambrian Bibliography, 1546–1800 (Danidloes: 1869), — in Welsh. / J. BALLINGER and J. I. JONES, Catalogue of Printed Lit. in the Welsh Dept., Cardiff Free Libraries (Cardiff: 1898). / E. OWEN, A Catalogue of the MSS. relating to Wales in the British Museum (Lond.: 1900). / J. G. EVANS, Report on MSS. in the Welsh Lang. (2 vols. Lond.: 1898–1902). / J. H. DAVIES, A Bibliog. of Welsh Ballads printed in the 18th Century (Aberystwyth: 1911; Trans. Hon. Soc. of Cymmrodorion). / National Library of Wales, Bibliotheca Celtica (Aberystwyth: 1910 +; quarterly bulletin), — "a register of publications relating to Wales and the Celtic peoples and languages." / See also the histories that follow.

B. *Histories.* *T. STEPHENS, The Lit. of the Kymry, 12th–14th Century (Lond.: 1849; 2d ed. 1876). / C. WILKINS, Hist. of the Lit. of Wales, 1300–1650 (Cardiff: 1884). / G. DOTTIN, La litt. galloise (in *Rev. de synthèse historique*, 6: 317–362. Paris: 1903). / *J. C. MORRICE, A Manual of Welsh Lit., 500–1800 (Bangor: 1909). / *L. C. STERN, Die kymrische (walisische) Lit. (in Hinneberg's Kultur der Gegenwart, T. I, Abt. XI, 1. Berlin: 1909).

XXIII. **Cornish and Breton Poetry.**

A. *Cornish.*

Histories. R. POLWHELE, The Lang., Lit., and Lit. Characters of Cornwall (pt. I Lond.: 1806; pt. II in vol. V of 2d ed., 1816, of his Hist. of Cornwall). / W. P. JAGO, The Remains of Cornish Lit., in his English Cornish Dict. (Lond.: 1887), pp. vii–xv. / G. DOTTIN, La litt. cornique (in *Rev. de synthèse historique*, 8: 91–93. Paris: 1904). / H. JENNER, A Handbook of the Cornish Lang. (Lond.: 1904). / *L. C. STERN, Die kornische und die bretonische Lit. (in Hinneberg's Kultur der Gegenwart, T. I, Abt. XI, 1. Berlin: 1909).

B. *Breton.*

1. *Histories.* J. LOTH, Chrestomathie bretonne,— armoricain, gallois, cornique (Paris: 1890, pt. I). / G. DOTTIN, pp. 93–104 of the essay noted above, A. / *L. C. STERN, as noted above.

2. *Periodical. Annales de Bretagne* (Rennes: 1886 +),— with bibliography, since 1901, of works on Breton literature.

XXIV. **German Poetry.**

A. *Bibliography.*

1. *General.* There is no bibliography of the output of German literature as a whole; but see the works listed above, under IV, A.

2. *To 1526.* G. W. PANZER, Annalen der älteren deutschen Lit. . . . bis 1520 (Nürnberg: 1788); Zusätze bis 1520 (Leipz.: 1802), 1521–1526 (Nürnberg: 1805). / E. WELLER, Repertorium Typographicum, die deutsche Lit. im ersten Viertel des 16. Jahrh., im Anschluss an Hains Repertorium und Panzers Annalen (Nördlingen: 1864); Supplement I (1874), II (1885).

3. *1700–1892.* W. HEINSIUS, Allgemeines Bücher-Lexicon, 1700–1892 (19 vols. in 20. Leipz.: 1812–1894).

4. *1750–1910.* *C. G. KAYSER, Vollständiges Bücher-Lexicon, 1750 + (36 + vols. Leipz.: 1834–1911 +); with a Sachregister containing indexes to the first six vols., 1750–1832 (Leipz.: 1838), and a Sach- und Schlagwortregister to vols. 27–36, 1891–1910 (Leipz.: 1896–1912). Subject indexes for the years 1871 to 1890 may be had in J. C. Hinrichs, Repertorium über die nach den halbjährlichen Verzeichnissen, 1871–1885, erschienenen Bücher, etc., bearbeitet von E. Baldamus, mit einem Sachregister (3 vols. Leipz.: 1877–1886), and C. Georg, Schlagwort-Katalog, 1883 to date (Hannover: 1889 +). For works omitted from the lexicons of Heinsius, Hinrichs, and Kayser see G. Thelert's Supplement, etc. (Grossenhain: 1893).

5. *1750–1820.* J. S. ERSCH, Handbuch der deutschen Lit. (4 vols. Leipz.: 1822–1840).

6. *Retrospective and Current. 1797 to date.* J. C. HINRICHS, Halbjahrs-Katalog, etc. (Leipz.: 1798 +).

1842 to date. J. C. HINRICHS, *Wöchentliches Verzeichniss der erschienenen und der vorbereiteten Neuigkeiten des deutschen Buchhandels* (Leipz.: 1842 +).

1879 to date. J. KÜRSCHNER, Deutscher Litteratur-Kalender (Leipz.: 1879 +), — annual lists of authors and their works.

1904 to date. Deutscher Literaturkatalog (Leipz.: 1904 +. G. E. Stechert & Co.).

7. *Belles-Lettres.* H. HOFFMANN [VON FALLERSLEBEN], Die deutsche Philologie im Grundriss (Breslau: 1836), — largely superseded by Bahder's work. / K. H. HERMANN, Bibliotheca Germanica, Verzeichniss der vom Jahre 1830 bis Ende 1875 in Deutschland erschienenen Schriften über altdeutsche Sprache und Lit., etc. (Halle: 1877). / *K. VON BAHDER, Die deutsche Philologie im Grundriss (Paderborn: 1883), — extensive and especially valuable for the older philological studies; the history of the literature is not followed beyond the Middle High German period; does not list works on individual authors. / *K. GOEDEKE, Grundriss zur Gesch. der deutschen Dichtung, aus den Quellen (Hannover: 1859; 2d ed. 10 vols. Dresden: 1884–1913, vols. I–III by Goedeke, the others by specialists under the editorship of E. Goetze, vol. X carrying the history to 1830; 3d ed. vol. IV, Pts. 2–4, 3 vols. 1910–1913), — an indispensable and the most extensive bibliography, including notices of periods, authors, their works, and the critical and historical paraphernalia. / *K. BREUL, A Handy Bibliographical Guide to the Study of the German Language and Literature for the Use of Students and Teachers of German (Lond.: 1895), — a most useful selection "of the most important periodicals and books," to be supplemented by the completer bibliographies of Bahder, Goedeke, Bartels, Meyer, and Arnold. / *R. M. MEYER, Grundriss der neuern deutschen Litteraturgesch. (Berlin: 1902; 2d ed. 1907), — very helpful. The first part includes a select bibliography of general works on German literature; the second and more important part, a long but not always well-chosen list of works upon the movements and authors of the 19th century. / J. S. NOLLEN, Chronology and Practical Bibliography of Modern German Literature (Chicago: 1903). / *A. BARTELS, Handbuch zur Gesch. der deutschen Literatur (Leipz.: 1906; 2d ed. 1909), — an extremely practical and thorough handbook; the second edition should be used. / *R. F. ARNOLD, Allgemeine Bücherkunde zur neuern deutschen Literaturgesch. (Strassburg: 1910). This very valuable work contains carefully selected and annotated bibliographies, perspicuously arranged, of bibliographies, literary histories (general, of types and sub-types), biography, linguistics, religious history, philosophy, political history, etc.

See also Paul, noted above, XII, B; Koberstein, Wackernagel, and others noted below, under B.

For current bibliography see below, under C, *Periodicals*, noting especially the *Zeitschr. für deutsche Philol.*, the *Anzeiger* to the *Zeitschr. für deutsches Altertum*, and, best of all, the **Jahresb. für neuere deutsche Litteraturgesch.*

B. *Histories.*

1. *General.* D. G. MORHOF, Unterricht von der deutschen Sprache und Poesie (Kiel: 1682). Morhof, the first German historian to mention Shakespeare, is called the father of German literary history. Compare his Polyhistor sive de Notitia Auctorum et Rerum Commentarii (Lübeck: 1688). / E. NEUMEISTER, Specimen Dissertationis Historico-criticae de Poetis Germanicis huius Saeculi Praecipuis (Leipz.: 1695, 1706). / M. HUBER, Discours préliminaire sur l'hist. de la litt. allemande, in his Choix des poésies allemandes (Paris: 1766). / E. J. KOCH, Grundriss einer Gesch. der Sprache und Lit. der Deutschen bis auf Lessing (1795–1798). / F. BOUTERWEK, vols. IX–XII of the work (1801–1819) noted above, XII, B, 1. / A. KOBERSTEIN, Grundriss der Gesch. der deutschen Nationallit. (Leipz.: 1827; greatly enlarged in successive editions, — 4th ed. 3 vols. 1847–1866; 5th ed. by K. Bartsch, 5 vols. 1872–1873; etc.), — with a distinct leaning toward romanticism. / W. MENZEL, Die deutsche Lit. (2 vols. Stuttgart: 1828), — subjective, 'romanticistic' to a certain extent, and remembered chiefly because of a polemic against Goethe. The same author's Die deutsche Dichtung, etc. (3 vols. 1858–1859), is general in scope and unscientific. / W. TAYLOR, of Norwich, Historic Survey of German Poetry (3 vols. Lond.: 1830). / *G. G. GERVINUS, Gesch. der poetischen Nationallit. der Deutschen (Leipz.: 1835–1842; 2d ed. 1840–1844, as Gesch. der deutschen Dichtung; 5th ed., by K. Bartsch, 5 vols. Leipz.: 1871–1874), — one of the more important larger histories and the first to reveal the history of German literature as a definite development. / K. ROSENKRANZ, Zur Gesch. der deutschen Lit. (Königsberg: 1836). / *A. F. C. VILMAR, Gesch. der deutschen Nationallit. (1845; 26th ed. Marburg: 1905; cf. F. Metcalfe's Hist. of Germ. Lit., based on Vilmar, Lond.: 1858), — a forceful work, of deep national feeling, written from the Protestant point of view. / *W. WACKERNAGEL, Gesch. der deutschen Lit. (2 vols. 1848–1855; 2d ed., continued by E. Martin, 2 vols. Basel: 1879–1894), — with bibliography; the 2d ed. is a very useful work. / H. KURZ, Gesch. der deutschen Lit. (1850–1859; 7th ed. 3 vols. Leipz.: 1876). / J. K. L. CHOLEVIUS, Gesch. der deutschen Poesie nach ihren antiken Elementen (2 vols. Leipz.: 1854–1856). / W. LINDEMANN, Gesch. der deutschen Lit. (Freiburg: 1865; 8th ed. 1905–1906), — divided according to periods and types; Roman Catholic point of view. / J. VON EICHENDORFF, Gesch. der poetischen Lit. Deutschlands (3d ed. 2 vols. Paderborn: 1866). / J. GOSTWICK and R. HARRISON, Outlines of German Lit. (Lond.: 1873). / R. KÖNIG, Deutsche Literaturgesch. (1878; 32d ed. 2 vols. 1910), — popular, illustrated; not to be trusted implicitly. / BAYARD TAYLOR, Studies in German Lit. (N. Y.: 1879). / *W. SCHERER, Gesch. der deutschen Lit. (Berlin: 1883; 10th ed.

Berlin: 1905; English trans., from 3d German ed., by Mrs. F. C. Conybeare, 2 vols. N.Y.: 1886). This famous work, said by some to be the most significant contribution since Gervinus, is scientific in conception and is very largely the product of independent investigation. "Scherer," says Calvin Thomas, "is always brilliant and suggestive, but often incautious in treating theories of his own as if they were facts." The bibliographical appendix deserves special mention. / J. BÄCHTOLD, Gesch. der deutschen Lit. in der Schweiz (2 pts. Frauenfeld: 1887–1892). / K. LAMPRECHT, Deutsche Gesch. (1891–1909). In this celebrated history of Germany the many sections devoted to literature are of great worth. / J. K. HOSMER, A Short Hist. of German Lit. (Lond.: 1892). / *F. VOGT and M. KOCH, Gesch. der deutschen Lit. von den ältesten Zeiten bis zur Gegenwart (1897; 2d ed. 2 vols. Leipz.: 1904),—perhaps the best; bibliography. / J. W. NAGL and J. ZEIDLER, Deutsch-österreichische Literaturgesch. (2 vols. Wien: 1899–1914). / *A. BARTELS, Gesch. der deutschen Lit. (2 vols. Leipz.: 1901–1902; 5th and 6th ed. 1909),—opposed to the scientific school represented by Scherer; subjective and readable. / *K. FRANCKE, A Hist. of German Lit. as determined by Social Forces (N.Y.: 1901, being the 4th ed. of his Social Forces in German Lit., 1896). / *J. G. ROBERTSON, A Hist. of German Lit. (Edinb. and Lond.: 1902); for a brief conspectus compare his Lit. of Germany (Home University Library, Lond.: 1913). / *A. BOSSERT, Hist. de la litt. allemande (2d ed. 1904). / *A. BIESE, Deutsche Literaturgesch. (3 vols. München: 1907–1911),—an admirable presentation. / E. ENGEL, Gesch. der deutschen Lit. (2 vols. 2d ed. Leipz.: 1907; 16th ed. Wien: 1913),—superficial. / A. SALZER, Illustrierte Gesch. der deutschen Lit. (3 vols. München: 1907+),—profusely illustrated; Roman Catholic point of view. / *A. BARTELS, Handbuch zur Gesch. der deutschen Lit. (2d ed. Leipz.: 1909),—most convenient for brief, concise notices of authors and for bibliography of their works and works upon them. / A. M. CHUQUET, Litt. allemande (Paris: 1909). / *C. THOMAS, A Hist. of German Lit. (N.Y. and Lond.: 1909; Short Hists. of the Lits. of the World Series). / W. HAHN, Gesch. der poetischen Lit. der Deutschen (16th ed. Stuttgart: 1910),—a convenient handbook. / G. M. PRIEST, A Brief Hist. of German Lit. (Lond.: 1910). / For other works and detailed comment see Arnold (work cited above, A, 7), p. 86 ff.; for works on the literature of particular localities see Arnold, p. 103 ff.

2. *Beginnings to the Close of the Middle High German Period (1350).* F. VON DER HAGEN and J. G. BÜSCHING, Literarischer Grundriss zur Gesch. der deutschen Poesie von der ältesten Zeit bis in das 16. Jahrh. (Berlin: 1812),—the pioneer work in its field. / K. ROSENKRANZ, Gesch. der deutschen Poesie im Mittelalter (Halle: 1830). / W. SCHERER, Gesch. der deutschen Dichtung im 11. und 12. Jahrh. (in *Quellen und Forschungen*, No. 12. Strassburg: 1875; in Nos. 1 and 7 of the same series, see the same writer's Geistliche Poeten der deutschen Kaiserzeit, 1874–1875; and cf. his Gesch. der deutschen Lit.). / F. KHULL, Gesch. der altdeutschen

Dichtung (Graz: 1886), — from the beginnings through the Minnesang. / R. M. MEYER, Die altgerm. Poesie nach ihren formelhaften Elementen beschrieben (Berlin: 1889). / *J. KELLE, Gesch. der deutschen Lit. von der ältesten Zeit bis zum 13. Jahrh. (2 vols. Berlin: 1892–1896), — an admirable work. / W. GOLTHER, Gesch. der deutschen Lit. von den ersten Anfängen bis zum Ausgang des Mittelalters (Stuttgart: 1893, in Kürschner's Deutsche Nationallit., 163, I). / *R. KOEGEL, Gesch. der deutschen Lit. bis zum Ausgange des Mittelalters (2 pts. Strassburg: 1894–1897), — the product of painstaking, accurate research. / R. KOEGEL and W. BRUCKNER, in Paul's Grundriss der german. Philol. — the Old High German and Old Low German divisions of the literature (II, 1. 2d ed. 1901). / F. VOGT, in the same work — the Middle High German period. / K. FRANCKE, Die Kulturwerte der deutschen Lit. in ihrer gesch. Entwicklung, vol. I Die Kulturwerte der deutschen Lit. des Mittelalters (Berlin: 1910 +). / *W. GOLTHER, Die deutsche Dichtung im Mittelalter, 800–1500 (Stuttgart: 1912), — the best monograph on the period as a whole; supersedes former treatises; with bibliography. / H. K. A. KRÜGER, Gesch. der niederdeutschen oder plattdeutschen Lit. vom Heliand bis zur Gegenwart (Schwerin i. M.: 1913).

3. *Early New High German Period (1350–1700)*. L. UHLAND, Gesch. der deutschen Dichtung im 15. und 16. Jahrh. (from lectures of 1831; appeared in 1866 as the 2d pt. of Gesch. der altdeut. Poesie, which is vol. II of the Schriften zur Gesch. der Dichtung und Sage). / E. WELLER, Annalen der poet. Nationallit. im 16. und 17. Jahrh. (Freiburg i. B.: 1862–1864). / O. F. GRUPPE, Leben und Werke deutscher Dichter, etc. (5 vols. 1864–1870), — 17th century; romanticism. / *K. LEMCKE, Gesch. der deutschen Dichtung neuer Zeit (vol. I Opitz to Klopstock. Leipz.: 1871; 2d ed. 1882). / H. PALM, Beiträge zur Gesch. der deutschen Lit. des 16. und 17. Jahrh. (Breslau: 1877). / L. GEIGER, Renaissance und Humanismus in Italien und Deutschland (Berlin: 1882; 2d ed. 1899). / C. H. HERFORD, Studies in the Lit. Relations of England and Germany in the 16th Century (Cambridge: 1886). / K. BURDACH, Vom Mittelalter zur Reformation (1893). / A. STERN, Beiträge zur Literaturgesch. des 17. und 18. Jahrh. (Leipz.: 1893). / K. BORINSKI, Gesch. der deutschen Lit. seit dem Ausgang des Mittelalters (in Kürschner's Deutsche Nationallit., 163, II. 1894), — brief. / G. WATERHOUSE, The Lit. Relations of England and Germany in the 17th Century (Cambridge: 1914).

See also works on the Reformation by K. HAGEN, F. BEZOLD, A. E. BERGER, L. VON RANKE, and others.

4. *The 18th Century*. J. W. VON GOETHE, Wahrheit und Dichtung 1811 +; Bk. VII). / F. HORN, Die Poesie und Beredsamkeit der Deutschen von Luthers Zeit bis zur Gegenwart (3 vols. Berlin: 1822–1824), — 'romanticistic.' / H. GELZER, Die deutsche poetische Lit. seit Klopstock und Lessing (Leipz.: 1841; 2d ed. as Die neuere deutsche Nationallit. nach ihren ethischen und religiösen Gesichtspunkten, 2 vols. Leipz.:

1847–1849),—opposed to Young Germany. / J. HILLEBRAND, Die deutsche Nationallit., 18. bis 19. Jahrh. (3 vols. Hamburg und Gotha: 1845–1846; 3d ed. 1875). / *K. BIEDERMANN, Deutschland im 18. Jahrh. (6 vols. Leipz.: 1854–1870). / J. W. SCHAEFER, Gesch. der deutschen Lit. des 18. Jahrh. (Leipz.: 1855; 2d ed. 1885). / J. W. LOEBELL, Die Entwickelung der deutschen Poesie—Klopstock, Wieland, Lessing (3 vols. Braunschweig: 1856–1865). / J. C. MÖRIKOFER, Die schweizerische Lit. des 18. Jahrh. (Leipz.: 1861). / *H. HETTNER, Literaturgesch. des 18. Jahrh., III. Th.: Die deutsche Lit. im 18. Jahrh. (Braunschweig: 1864; 4th ed. 1893; 5th rev. ed. 3 vols. in 4. 1909). / J. SCHMIDT, Gesch. der deutschen Lit. von Leibniz bis auf unsere Zeit, 1670–1866 (5 vols. Berlin: 1888–1896). / E. GRISEBACH, Das Goethesche Zeitalter der deutschen Dichtung (Leipz.: 1891). / O. HARNACK, Der deutsche Klassizismus im Zeitalter Goethes (Berlin: 1906). / H. VON FISCHER, Die schwäbische Lit. im 18. und 19. Jahrh. (Tübingen: 1911). / O. F. WALZEL, Vom Geistesleben des 18. und 19. Jahrh. (Leipz.: 1911).

5. *The 19th Century.* F. HORN, Umrisse zur Gesch. und Kritik der schönen Lit. Deutschlands, 1790–1818 (Berlin: 1819–1821),—'romanticistic.' / *H. HEINE, Die romantische Schule (Hamburg: 1836; being the 2d ed. of Zur Gesch. der neueren schönen Lit. in Deutschland, 1833; English trans. by S. L. Fleishman, The Romantic School, N. Y.: 1882),—prejudiced and brilliant. / J. VON EICHENDORFF, Über die ethische und religiöse Bedeutung der neuren romantischen Poesie in Deutschland (Leipz.: 1847; later the 2d pt. of his Gesch. der poetischen Lit. Deutschlands, Paderborn: 1857). / R. E. PRUTZ, Vorlesungen über die deutsche Lit. der Gegenwart (Leipz.: 1847). / K. BARTHEL, Die deutsche Nationallit. der Neuzeit (Braunschweig: 1850; 2d enlarged ed. 1851),—may be regarded as a continuation of Vilmar, for it is in a similar spirit of religious orthodoxy. / *H. HETTNER, Die romantische Schule in ihrem Zusammenhang mit Goethe und Schiller (Braunschweig: 1850),—one of the first significant, scientific treatments of the subject. / J. SCHMIDT, Gesch. der deutschen Nationallit. im 19. Jahrh. (Leipz.: 1853; expanded to Gesch. der deutschen Lit. seit Lessings Tod, 5th ed. 3 vols. Leipz.: 1866–1867; also included in the work noted above, under 4). / *R. VON GOTTSCHALL, Gesch. der deutschen Nationallit. in der ersten Hälfte des 19. Jahrh. (Breslau: 1855; later as Die deutsche Nationallit. des 19. Jahrh., 7th ed. 4 vols. Leipz.: 1901–1902),—one-sided in its interest in the Young Germany movement. / R. E. PRUTZ, Die deutsche Lit. der Gegenwart, 1848–1858 (Leipz.: 1859; 2d ed. 1860). / *R. HAYM, Die romantische Schule (Berlin: 1870; 3d ed. by O. Walzel, 1914). / *G. BRANDES, The Romantic School in Germany, Young Germany (being vols. II, VI of Main Currents in 19th Century Lit., cited above, XII, B, 1). / E. GRISEBACH, Die deutsche Lit., 1770–1870 (Wien: 1876; 2d ed. as Die deutsche Lit. seit 1770, Stuttgart: 1877; 4th ed. Berlin: 1887). / H. VON TREITSCHKE, Gesch. im 19. Jahrh., 1800–1848 (5 vols. Leipz.: 1879–1894; being vols. XXIV–XXVIII of his

Staatengesch. der neuesten Zeit), — brilliant, pan-German. / K. BLEIBTREU, Revolution der Lit. (Leipz.: 1886), — symptomatic. / *A. STERN, Deutsche Nationallit. vom Tode Goethes bis zur Gegenwart (Marburg: 1886; 5th ed. 1905). / F. WEHL, Das junge Deutschland (Hamburg: 1886). / H. BAHR, Die Überwindung des Naturalismus (Dresden: 1891). / J. PROELSS, Das junge Deutschland (Stuttgart: 1892). / R. M. SAITSCHICK, Meister der schweizerischen Dichtung des 19. Jahrh. (Frauenfeld: 1894). / *A. BARTELS, Die deutsche Dichtung der Gegenwart (in *Grenzboten*, 1896; 8th ed. 1910). / E. WOLFF, Gesch. der deutschen Lit. in der Gegenwart (Leipz.: 1896), — by types, from 1870 on. / L. BERG, Der Übermensch in der modernen Lit. (München: 1897). / H. H. BOYESEN, Essays on German Lit., — Goethe, Schiller, Romantic School, etc. (4th rev. ed. N.Y.: 1898). / R. HUCH, Blütezeit der Romantik (Leipz.: 1899; 3d ed. 1908). / G. S. LUBLINSKI, Lit. und Gesellschaft im 19. Jahrh. (4 vols. in 2. Berlin: 1899–1900). / MÖLLER VAN DEN BRUCK, Die moderne Lit. in Gruppen und Einzeldarstellungen (Berlin: 1899 +). / *A. VON HANSTEIN, Das jüngste Deutschland (Berlin: 1900; 3d ed. 1905). / M. LORENZ, Die Lit. am Jahrh. (Stuttgart: 1900). / *R. M. MEYER, Die deutsche Lit. des 19. Jahrh. (Berlin: 1900; 4th ed. 1910), — "wertlos," says Bartels; but the work is spirited and admirable in many respects. / K. BUSSE, Gesch. der deutschen Dichtung im 19. Jahrh. (Berlin: 1901), — popular. / M. G. CONRAD, Von Emile Zola bis G. Hauptmann (Leipz.: 1902). / R. HUCH, Ausbreitung und Verfall der Romantik (Leipz.: 1902; 2d ed. 1908). / *R. M. MEYER, Grundriss der neuern deutschen Literaturgesch. (Berlin: 1902). / L. BRÄUTIGAM, Übersicht über die neuere Lit. 1880–1902 (2d ed. Kassel: 1903). / J. F. COAR, Studies in German Lit. in the 19th Century (N.Y.: 1903). / *P. HENZE, Gesch. der deutschen Lit. von Goethes Tode bis zur Gegenwart (2d ed. Leipz.: 1903), — perspicuous and stimulating. / O. HELLER, Studies in Modern German Lit. (Boston: 1905). / H. HÖLZKE, Zwanzig Jahre deutscher Lit. 1885–1905 (Braunschweig: 1905). / M. JOACHIMI, Die Weltanschauung der Romantik (Jena: 1905). / K. JOEL, Nietzsche und die Romantik (Jena: 1905). / E. KIRCHER, Philosophie der Romantik (Jena: 1906). / L. GEIGER, Das junge Deutschland (Berlin: 1907). / O. F. WALZEL, Deutsche Romantik, eine Skizze (Leipz.: 1908; 3d ed. 1912; Aus Natur und Geisteswelt series), — very brief and helpful. / F. KUMMER, Deutsche Literaturgesch. des 19. Jahrh. (Dresden: 1909; 2d ed. 1910). / M. MURET, La litt. allemande d'aujourd'hui (1909). / O. E. LESSING, Die neue Form, ein Beitrag zum Verständnis des deutschen Naturalismus (Dresden: 1910). / K. MARTENS, Lit. in Deutschland (Berlin: 1910). / *R. M. WERNAER, Romanticism and the Romantic School in Germany (N.Y.: 1910), — with bibliography. / K. M. BRISCHAR, Deutschösterreichische Lit. der Gegenwart (Leipz.: 1911). / P. POLLARD, Masks and Minstrels of New Germany (Boston: 1911). / A. SOERGEL, Dichtung und Dichter der Zeit, eine Schilderung der deutschen Lit. der letzten Jahrzehnte (Leipz.: 1911), — extensive. / O. E. LESSING, Masters in Modern German Lit. (Dresden.

1912). / *R. RIEMANN, Das 19. Jahrh. der deutschen Lit. (2d rev. ed. Leipz.: 1912). / G. WITKOWSKI, Die Entwicklung der deutschen Lit. seit 1830 (Leipz.: 1912). / *F. BRÜMMER, Lexikon der deutschen Dichter und Prosaisten vom Beginn des 19. Jahrh. bis zur Gegenwart (8 vols. 6th rev. ed. Leipz.: 1913), — very convenient. / A. W. PORTERFIELD, An Outline of German Romanticism (Boston: 1914). / L. LEWISOHN, The Spirit of Modern German Lit. (N.Y.: 1916).

C. *Periodicals and Series of Monographs.* For some of the most important references see above, XII, C, 1, 4. / **Zeitschr. für deutsches Altertum und deutsche Lit.* (Leipz. und Berlin: 1841 +; title, 1841–1876, *Zeitschr. f. deut. Altertum*), — quarterly; articles rather than reviews, dealing for most part with the older lit. to 1500. / *Litterarisches Centralblatt für Deutschland* (Leipz.: 1850 +), — weekly; bibliography of articles in periodicals. / *Weimarisches Jahrbuch für deutsche Sprache, Lit. und Kunst* (6 vols. Hannover: 1854–1857), — lit. after 1500. / **Germania, Vierteljahrsschrift für deutsche Altertumskunde* (Stuttgart: 1856–1892; often referred to as *Pfeiffer's Germania*), — articles and reviews; good bibliography. See also its supplementary *Germanistische Studien* (2 vols. Wien: 1872–1875). / **Zeitschr. für deutsche Philologie* (Halle, Berlin, etc.: 1868 +), — quarterly; articles and reviews. / *Archiv für Litteraturgesch.* (Leipz.: 1870–1887), — quarterly; modern German lit. / *Alemannia, Zeitschr. für Sprache, Lit. und Volkskunde des Elsasses, Oberrheins und Schwabens* (Bonn: 1873 +; later, changes in title). / **Beiträge zur Gesch. der deutschen Sprache und Lit.* (Halle a. S.: 1874 +), — thrice yearly; articles and reviews, older lit. / *Jahrbuch des Vereins für niederdeutsche Sprachforschung* (Bremen, etc.: 1875 +). / **Anzeiger für deutsches Altertum und deutsche Lit.* (1876 +), — reviews only; supplementary to the first *Zeitschr.* noted above. / **Deutsche Literaturzeitung* (Berlin: 1880 +), — reviews of German, including literary, works. / **Goethe Jahrbuch* (Frankfurt a. M.: 1880 +), — annual; articles, reviews, bibliography. / **Germanistische Abhandlungen* (Breslau: 1882 +), — monographs. / **Vierteljahrschrift für Litteraturgesch.* (6 vols. Weimar: 1888–1893). / *Lipps und Werner's Beiträge zur Ästhetik* (Hamburg: 1890 +). / **Jahresberichte für neuere deutsche Litteraturgesch.* (Stuttgart, etc.: 1892 +, for 1890 +), — reviews, bibliography; very conveniently arranged by periods and types. / **Euphorion, Zeitschr. für Litteraturgesch.* (Bamberg: 1894 +), — articles, reviews, bibliography. / **Litterarhist. Forschungen* (Weimar und Berlin: 1897 +), — articles; primarily Germanic in scope. / *Das deutsche Volkslied* (1899 +). / *Rivista di letteratura tedesca* (1907 +).

For further notice of periodicals see Arnold (cited above, A, 7), p. 23 ff. See also the publications of various German and Austrian universities, especially those of Berlin, Vienna, and Munich.

XXV. **Dutch Poetry.**

A. *Bibliography.* For national bibliographies see R. A. PEDDIE, National Bibliographies, pp. 16–17; N. Y. State Library Bulletin 38, "Selected

National Bibliographies" (1915), pp. 42–44. For belles-lettres see L. D. PETIT, Bibliographie der Mnl. Taal en Letterkunde (Leiden: 1888); also the bibliographical notes in the histories of the literature, especially in Paul's Grundriss (J. te Winkel); also see above, XII, A.

B. *Histories.* SIR J. BOWRING and H. S. VAN DYKE, Batavian Anthology or Specimens of the Dutch Poets, with remarks on the poetical lit. of the Netherlands to the end of the 17th century (Lond.: 1824), — a very slender little volume. / SIR J. BOWRING, Sketch of the Lang. and Lit. of Holland (Amst.: 1829). / *W. J. A. JONCKBLOET, Geschiedenis der middennederl. Dichtkunst (3 vols. Amst.: 1851–1854) and Gesch. der nederlandsche Letterkunde (Groningen: 1868; 4th ed. 2 vols. 1887–1889, by C. Honigh; German trans. of the 1st Dutch ed., by W. Berg, i.e. L. Schneider, 2 vols. in 1, Leipz.: 1870–1872), — with bibliography. / J. VAN VLOTEN, Schets van de Gesch. der nederlandsche Letteren (Tiel: 1871). / J. TEN BRINK, Kleine Gesch. der nederlandsche Letteren (Haarlem: 1877; 2d ed. 1882). / J. TE WINKEL, Gesch. der nederlandsche Letterkunde (Haarlem: 1887). / G. KALFF, Gesch. der nederlandsche Letterkunde in de 16 Eeuw (2 vols. Leiden: 1889–1890). / *J. TE WINKEL, Niederländische Lit. (in Paul's Grundriss, II, 1, 1893; 2d ed. 1902), — standard, authoritative; carries the history to the 17th century. / L. VAN DEYSSEL, Verzamelde Opstellen (4 vols. Amst.: 1894 (?) +). / G. KALFF, Lit. en tooneel te Amsterdam in de 20 Eeuw (Haarlem: 1895). / W. KLOOS, Veertien Jaar Lit.-Gesch., 1880–1893 (2 vols. Amst.: 1896). / *J. TEN BRINK, Gesch. der nederlandsche Letterkunde (Amst.: 1897) and Gesch. der noord-nederlandsche Letteren in de 19 Eeuw (new ed. Rotterdam: 1902 +), — a series of monographs and bibliographies. / E. GOSSE, Art. Dutch Lit., Encyc. Brit., 11th ed.

C. *Periodicals*, etc. See above, XII, C, 4.

XXVI. **Icelandic Poetry.**

See above, § 6, XVI; § 12, XIII; below, XXVIII. For national bibliographies see PEDDIE, National Bibliographies, pp. 18–19.

XXVII. **Swedish Poetry.**

A. *Bibliographies.* See PEDDIE, *op. cit.*, pp. 30–31; N.Y. State Library Bulletin 38 (1915), pp. 45–46; for a list of English works relating to the Scandinavian countries see T. Solberg's Bibliography of Scandinavia in Anderson's translation of Horn's work noted below. / For an admirable bibliography of the Middle Ages see R. GEETE in No. 124 of the Samlingar utg. af svenska Fornskriftsällskapet (Stockholm: 1903). / See also P. A. SONDÉN and L. HAMMARSKÖLD, as noted above, § 6, XVII; also above, XII, A.

B. *Histories.* G. LJUNGGREN, Svenska Vitterhetens häfder från Gustaf Död (1818–1819; 3 vols. 1833; etc.). / X. MARMIER, Hist. de la litt. en Danemark et en Suède (Paris: 1839). / W. and MARY HOWITT, Lit. and

Romance of Northern Europe (2 vols. Lond.: 1852). / B. E. MALMSTRÖM, Grunddragen af svenska Vitterhetens Historia (Örebro: 1866–1868). / L. DIETRICHSON, Indledning i Studiet af sveriges Lit. i vort Aarenhundrede (Copenhagen: 1870). / C. R. NYBLOM, Estetiska Studier (Stockholm: 1873–1884). / K. V. BREMER, Kurs i svenska Literaturens Historie (Helsingfors: 1874). / E. W. GOSSE, Studies in the Lit. of Northern Europe (Lond.: 1879). / *F. W. HORN, Gesch. der Lit. des skandinavischen Nordens, etc. (Leipz.: 1880; English trans. by R. B. Anderson, Hist. of the Lit. of the Scandinavian North, Chicago: 1884, also 1895). / H. SCHÜCK, Svensk Literaturhistoria (1885, etc.). / *P. SCHWEITZER, Gesch. der scandinavischen Lit., in vol. VIII of Gesch. der Weltlit. in Einzeldarstellungen (3 pts. Leipz.: 1886–1889). / *H. SCHÜCK and K. WARBURG, Illustrerad svensk Literaturhistoria (2 vols. in 3. Stockholm: 1895–1897). / J. A. LUNDELL, Skandinavische Volkspoesie (in Paul's Grundriss, II, 1, 1901, etc.). / *H. SCHÜCK, Schwedischdänische Lit. (in Paul's Grundriss, II, 1, 1901, etc.), — a brief review extending through the Middle Ages; with bibliography. / O. LEVERTIN, Svenska Gestalter (1904). / *R. STEFFEN, Överskit av svenska Lit. (5 vols. Stockholm: 1906–1907). / *E. W. GOSSE, Art. Swedish Lit., Encyc. Brit., 11th ed.

C. W. STORK's admirable Anthology of Swedish Lyrics, 1750–1915, translated in the original meters (N.Y.: 1917, Scandinavian Classics, IX), should have been noted above, p. 340.

C. *Periodicals*. See above, XII, C, 4.

XXVIII. **Danish-Norwegian Poetry.**

A. *Bibliographies*. See PEDDIE, National Bibliographies, pp. 6–7, 23–24; N.Y. State Library Bulletin 38, "Selected National Bibliographies," pp. 44–45, 46–47. Works of the Middle Ages are listed in MOEBIUS, Catalogus Librorum Islandicorum et Norvegicorum Aetatis Mediae (Leipz.: 1856); bibliography of studies of the same period is to be found in the same author's Verzeichnis der auf dem Gebiete der altnordischen Sprache und Literatur von 1859–1879 erschienenen Schriften (Leipz.: 1880); for later years and broader fields, in the *Ark. f. nord. Fil.* (1883 +) and the periodicals for Germanic philology mentioned above, XII, C, 4.

B. *Histories*. Some of the works noted above, XXVII, B, cover part or the whole of this field. In addition the following may be mentioned: R. NYERUP, Den danske Digtekunst Historie (1800–1808). / N. M. PETERSEN, Danske Literaturhistorie (2d ed. 5 vols. Copenhagen: 1867–1872). / G. BRANDES, Kritiker og Portraiter (1870) and Danske Digtere (1877). / *H. JAEGER, Illustreret norsk Literaturhistorie (2 vols. in 3. Christiania: 1892–1896; continued by C. Naerup, Siste Tidsrum 1890–1894, 1905). / *F. JÓNSSON, Den oldnorske og oldislandske Lit. Historie (3 vols. Copenhagen: 1894–1902), — exhaustive, authoritative. / A. P. J. SCHENER, Kortfattet Inledning til romantikkus Periode i Danmarks Lit. (Copenhagen: 1894). / H. H. BOYESEN, Essays on Scandinavian Lit. (Lond.: 1895). /

*P. **Hansen**, Illustreret dansk Literaturhistorie (3 vols. in 2. Copenhagen: 1895–1902),—with a chronological list of authors and works. / J. **Paludan**, Danmarks Lit. i Middelalderen (Copenhagen: 1896). / **Marie Hertzfeld**, Die skandinavische Lit. und ihre Tendenzen (Berlin: 1898). / *E. **Mogk**, Norwegisch-isländische Lit. (in Paul's Grundriss, 2d ed., 1901 etc.),—earlier periods; authoritative, accurate; with bibliography. / *J. J. **Jörgensen**, Gesch. der dänischen Lit. (Kempten und München: 1908. Sammlung Kösel),—a brief introduction. / *E. **Gosse**, articles on Norwegian and Danish literatures, in Encyc. Brit., 11th ed.

C. *Periodicals.* See above, XII, C, 4.

XXIX. Slavic Poetry in General.

B. *Histories* (those in Slavic languages are not noted; for them see Karásek; Hinneberg, Die Kultur der Gegenwart, T. I, Abt. IX; Encyc. Brit.). / **Talvi** (i.e. Mrs. T. A. L. Robinson), Hist. View of the Langs. and Lits. of the Slavic Nations, etc. (N.Y.: 1850),—taken without acknowledgment from other works; antiquated. / P. J. **Šafařík**, Gesch. der slawischen Sprache und Lit. (2d ed. Prag: 1869). / A. N. **Pypin** and V. D. **Spasovicz**, Gesch. der slawischen Lit. (trans. by T. Pech from the 2d Russian ed. 2 vols. Leipz.: 1880–1884). / L. **Leger**, Nouvelles études slaves (Paris: 1880) and several other works (Le monde slave au 19e siècle; Russes et Slaves; Le monde slave, études politiques et litt.) of various dates. / W. R. **Morfill**, Slavonic Lit. (Lond.: 1883),—a mere sketch. / G. **Krek**, Einleitung in die slavische Literaturgesch. (Graz: 1874; 2d rev. ed. 1887). / *A. **Mickiewicz**, Cours de litt. slave (lectures, 1840; 5 vols. Paris: 1860) and Vorlesungen über slawische Lit. und Zustände (lectures, 1841; new ed. 4 vols. Leipz.: 1849). / *J. **Karásek**, Slavische Literaturgesch. (2 vols. Leipz.: 1906; Sammlung Göschen),—a brief, convenient introduction.

C. *Periodicals.* **Archiv für slavische Philologie* (Berlin: 1876+).

XXX. Russian Poetry.

A. *Bibliography.* See **Peddie**, National Bibliographies, pp. 27–28. See also the histories mentioned below, especially those of Wesselovsky, Brückner, Waliszewski, and Kropotkin; also Wiener, above, p. 352.

B. *Histories* (for those in Russian or other Slavic tongues see Karásek, noted above, XXIX; Leo Wiener, noted above, p. 352; Brückner, Waliszewski, etc., noted below). / C. **Courrière**, Hist. de la litt. contemporaine en Russie (Paris: 1875). / C. E. **Turner**, Studies in Russian Lit. (Lond.: 1882). / *A. von **Reinholdt**, Gesch. der russischen Lit., etc. (Leipz.: 1886). / L. **Sichler**, Hist. de la litt. russe depuis les origines jusqu'à nos jours (Paris: 1886). / *K. **Waliszewski**, Hist. of Russian Lit. (Lond.: 1900; Short Hists. of the Lits. of the World Series). / I. F. **Hapgood**, Survey of Russian Lit. (Chautauqua Press, N.Y.: 1902). / A. **Wolynski**, Die russische Lit. der Gegenwart (in Moderne Essays, ed. H. Landsberg, vol. XX. Berlin:

1902). / P. A. KROPOTKIN, Russian Lit. (N.Y.: 1905). / ROSA NEWMARCH, Poetry and Progress in Russia (Lond.: 1907). / *A. BRÜCKNER, Gesch. der russischen Lit. (Leipz.: 1905; English trans. by H. Havelock, ed. by E. H. Minns, Lond.: 1908), — standard and authoritative. / A. BRÜCKNER, Russlands geistige Entwicklung im Spiegel seiner schönen Lit. (Tübingen: 1908). / A. WESSELOVSKY, Die russische Lit. (in Hinneberg's Kultur der Gegenwart, T. I, Abt. IX. 1908). / *W. R. MORFILL, Art. Russian Lit., Encyc. Brit., 11th ed. (1911). / L. LEGER, La Russie intellectuelle, études et portraits (Paris: 1914). / M. BARING, An Outline of Russian Lit. (N.Y.: 1915; Home University Library). / NADINE JARINTZOV, Russian Poets and Poems, etc. (Vol. I, N.Y.: 1917).

XXXI. **Polish Poetry.**

A. *Bibliographies.* K. ESTREICHER, Bibliografja polska (Krakau: 1870+). / Others are given by PEDDIE, National Bibliographies, pp. 25–26.

B. *Histories.* SIR JOHN BOWRING, Specimens of the Polish Poets, etc. (Lond.: 1827). / H. NITSCHMANN, Der polnische Parnass (4th enlarged ed. Leipz.: 1875) and Gesch. der polnischen Lit. (Leipz.: n.d.). / P. SOBOLESKI, Poets and Poetry of Poland (Chicago: 1881). / *A. BRÜCKNER, Gesch. der polnischen Lit. (Leipz.: 1901) and Die polnische Lit. (in Hinneberg's Kultur der Gegenwart, T. I, Abt. IX. 1908). / W. R. MORFILL, Art. Polish Lit., Encyc. Brit., 11th ed. (1911). / Several other works are mentioned above, p. 354.

See also works in Polish by A. BRÜCKNER, P. CHMIELOWSKI, S. TARNOWSKI, W. FELDMAN, H. BIEGELEISEN, GRABOWSKI, etc.

XXXII. **Cheskian (Bohemian) Poetry.**

A. *Bibliographies.* See JAKUBEC and NOVÁK (cited below), p. vii. For a German collection of Cheskian poetry see E. ALBERT, Poesie aus Böhmen (3 vols. in 4. Wien: 1893–1895) and Lyrisches und Verwandtes aus der böhmischen Lit. (1900). Jelinek (see below) cites several other translations into German (p. 363).

B. *Histories.* J. DOBROVSKÝ, Gesch. der böhmischen Sprache und Lit. (Prag: 1818). / A. H. WRATISLAW, The Native Lit. of Bohemia in the 14th Century (Lond.: 1878). / COUNT LÜTZOW, Ancient Bohemian Lit. (in *New Review*, Feb. 1897). / F. P. MARCHANT, An Outline of Bohemian Lit. (Lond.: 1898). / *COUNT LÜTZOW, Hist. of Bohemian Lit. (Lond.: 1899; Short Hists. of the Lits. of the World Series). / *JAN MÁCHAL, Die böhmische Lit. (in Hinneberg's Kultur der Gegenwart, T. I, Abt. IX. 1908). / *J. JAKUBEC, Gesch. der čechischen Lit.; A. NOVÁK, Die čechische Lit. der Gegenwart (Leipz.: 1907; 2d ed. 1909; Die Lit. des Ostens). / COUNT LÜTZOW, Art. Bohemian Lit., Encyc. Brit., 11th ed. (1910). / *H. JELINEK, La litt. tchèque contemporaine (lectures at the Sorbonne, 1910; 2d ed. Paris: 1912), — with bibliography. / L. LEGER, La renaissance tchèque au 19e siècle (Paris: 1910).

See also the works on South-Slavic literatures noted below, XXXIII, B.

In Cheskian or other Slavic languages are important works by J. Vobornık, J. Vlček, J. Karásek, K. Tieftrunk, V. Flajšhans, F. V. Jeřábek, J. Jireček, J. Jungmann, A. V. Šembera, J. V. Novák, etc. (titles in Lützow, 1899, and Karásek, vol. I of the work noted above, XXIX). For late Cheskian literature see the extensive Literatura česká 19 století (Prag: 1902 +).

C. *Periodicals*. See Lützow (1899); Jelinek (1912), p. 362.

XXXIII. **Serbian and other South-Slavic Poetry.**

A. *Bibliographies*. See PEDDIE, National Bibliographies, pp. 3, 5, 29; / HINNEBERG, Die Kultur der Gegenwart, T. I, Abt. IX (1908), p. 245; / the histories mentioned below.

B. *Histories*. P. J. ŠAFAŘÍK, Gesch. der südslawischen Lit. (ed. by J. Jireček. 3 vols. Prag: 1864–1865), — with bibliography. / A. N. PYPIN and V. D. SPASOVICZ, Gesch. der slawischen Lit. (German trans. by T. Pech from the 2d Russian ed. 2 vols. Leipz.: 1880–1884). / *M. MURKO, Gesch. der älteren südslawischen Lit. (Leipz.: 1908; Die Lit. des Ostens), — with bibliography; Die südslawischen Lit. (in Hinneberg, Kultur der Gegenwart, T. I, Abt. IX. 1908). / Articles in Encyc. Brit., 11th ed. (1910–1911). / See also above, XXIX.

For works in Slavic languages see KARÁSEK and MURKO.

XXXIV. **Hungarian (Magyar) Poetry.**

A. *Bibliographies*. See PEDDIE, National Bibliographies, p. 18. / REICH and RIEDL, as noted below. / KONT, noted below, — pp. 411–413 contain a valuable list of French monographs dealing with Hungarian lit. / A. DUX, Aus Ungarn (Leipz.: 1880).

B. *Histories*. SIR JOHN BOWRING, Poetry of the Magyars, etc. (Lond.: 1830), based largely on Schedel's (Francis Toldy's) Handbuch der ungarischen Poesie (2 vols. Pest und Wien: 1828). / Two other works by Schedel were translated into German: Gesch. der ungarischen Dichtung, etc. (1863), and Gesch. der ungarischen Lit. im Mittelalter (1865). / *J. SCHWICKER, Gesch. der ungarischen Lit. (Leipz.: 1889). / G. A. ZIGÁNY, Letteratura ungherese (Milano: 1892; Manuali Hoepli), — a brief introduction. / W. N. LOEW, Magyar Poetry (N.Y.: 1899). / E. REICH, Hungarian Lit. (Lond.: 1898). / *I. KONT, Hist. de la litt. hongroise (Paris: 1900), — adapted from the standard history, in the Magyar language, of C. Horváth (Budapest: 1899) and from works by A. Kardos and A. Endrödi; with bibliography. / *I. (J.) KONT, Gesch. der ungarischen Lit. (Leipz.: 1906; Die Lit. des Ostens). / *F. RIEDL, Hist. of Hungarian Lit. (N.Y.: 1906; Short Hists. of the Lits. of the World) and Die ungarische Lit. (in Hinneberg's Kultur der Gegenwart, T. I, Abt. IX. 1908). / E. D. BUTLER, Art. Hungarian Lit., Encyc. Brit., 11th ed. (1911).

For accounts in the Magyar language see the authorities quoted at the end of the article in the Encyc. Brit.

C. *Periodicals. Literarische Berichte aus Ungarn* (1877–1880). / *Ungarische Revue* (1881–1895). / *Revue philologique hongroise* (1878). / For reviews in the Magyar language see REICH, *op. cit.*, p. 258.

XXXV. **Oriental Poetry in General.**

A. *Bibliographies.* A continuous bibliography of oriental studies, etc., is furnished by the following: Zenker's Bibliotheca Orientalis (1846–1861); Wissenschaftlicher Jahresbericht über die morgenländischen Studien (1859–1881); Friederici, Bibliotheca Orientalis (1876–1883); *Literaturblatt für orientalische Philologie* (1883–1886); *Orientalische Bibliographie* (Berlin: 1887 +). / T. W. BEALE'S An Oriental Biographical Dictionary (new ed. Lond.: 1894) affords a means of ready reference. / See also, for current bibliography, the periodicals noted below, C. For bibliographies of works printed in China, Hong-Kong, India, Japan, etc., see Peddie, National Bibliographies, p. 5 ff.

For Burma, Assam, Laos, Malay Peninsula, and French Indo-China, see H. Cordier, Bibliotheca Indosinica, etc. (4 vols. in 3. Paris: 1912–1915).

B. *Histories.* See above, IV, B. BAUMGARTNER'S work is especially valuable for the student of oriental literatures. / W. R. ALGER'S Poetry of the Orient (Boston: 1865; later ed. 1883; originally Poetry of the East, 1856) contains a few translations with a general, appreciative introduction; of no historical or scientific value.

C. *Periodicals. The Asiatic Journal* (Lond.: 1816–1845). / **Journal asiatique* (Paris: 1822 +), — with bibliography. / **Journal of the Royal Asiatic Soc. of Great Britain and Ireland* (Lond.: 1834 +; Straits Branch, Singapore: 1878 +). / **Zeitschr. der deutschen morgenländischen Gesellschaft* (Leipz.: 1847 +). / **Journal of the American Oriental Soc.* (Boston, etc.: 1849 +). / *Orient und Occident* (Göttingen: 1862–1866). / *International Congress of Orientalists, Transactions* (Paris, etc.: 1874 +). / *The Asiatic Quarterly Review* (Lond.: 1886 +). / **Giornale della società asiatica italiana* (Firenze: 1887 +). / **Wiener Zeitschr. für die Kunde des Morgenlandes* (Wien: 1887 +), — with bibliography. / *Bessarione, Pubblicazione periodica di studi orientali* (Roma: 1896 +). / *Mittheilungen des Seminars für orientalische Sprachen zu Berlin* (1898–1904). / *Orientalische Literaturzeitung* (Berlin: 1898–1908), — near Orient. / *Le monde oriental*, etc. (Uppsala: 1906 +). / **Memnon, Zeitschr. für die Kunst- und Kulturgesch. des alten Orients* (Leipz., etc.: 1907 +), — with bibliography. / **Rivista degli studi orientali* (Roma: 1907 +), — with bibliography.

See also the oriental publications of the Musée Guimet and of various European and American universities.

XXXVI. **Turkish Poetry.**

A. *Bibliographies.* See above, XXXV, A.

B. *Histories.* The most important work is *E. J. W. GIBB'S Hist. of Ottoman Poetry (6 vols. Lond.: 1900–1909; vols. II–VI edited by E. G.

Browne). Other references are given above, pp. 354–355. Attention is also called to *P. HORN, Gesch. der türkischen Moderne (Leipz.: 1902; Die Lit. des Ostens, vol. IV), and to a history in the Russian language, by Smirnow (St. Petersburg: 1889).

C. *Periodicals*. See above, XXXV, C.

XXXVII. **Arabian Poetry.**

See above, pp. 355–356; also above, XXXV, A, C. See also V. CHAUVIN, Bibliographie des ouvrages arabes ou relatifs aux Arabes publiés dans l'Europe chrétienne de 1810 à 1885 (9 vols. in 3. Liége: 1892–1905).

XXXVIII. **Persian Poetry.**

A. *Bibliographies*. See Vol. I, pp. 481–496, of BROWNE'S Lit. Hist. of Persia and the articles in the Grundriss, both of which are noted below. See also pp. 105–118 of SALEMANN and ZHUKOVSKI'S Persische Grammatik. For catalogues see the Grundriss, vol. II, p. 217; or Encyc. Brit., Art. Modern Persian Lit. See also above, XXXV, A.

B. *Histories*. G. L. FLÜGEL (in Ersch and Gruber's Allgemeine Encyk. 1842). / N. BLAND (in *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Soc.*, 7: 345, 9: 111. 1843–1846). / SIR GORE OUSELEY, Biographical Notices of Persian Poets (Lond.: 1846). / C. A. C. BARBIER DE MEYNARD, Poésie en Perse (Paris: 1877). / M. HAUG, Essays on the Sacred Language, Writings and Religion of the Parsis (2d ed., by E. W. West. Lond.: 1878). / J. DARMESTETER, Les origines de la poésie persane (Paris: 1887). / *H. ETHÉ, Höfische und romantische Poesie der Perser (Hamburg: 1887). / I. PIZZI, Manuale di lett. persiana (Milano: 1887). / *H. ETHÉ, Mystische, didaktische und lyrische Poesie und das spätere Schrifttum der Perser (Hamburg: 1888). / ELIZABETH A. REED, Persian Lit., Ancient and Modern (Chicago: 1893), — popular. / *I. PIZZI, Storia della poesia persiana (2 vols. Torino: 1894). / *W. GEIGER and E. KUHN, Grundriss der iranischen Philologie (2 vols. Strassburg: 1895–1904), — the standard, authoritative work. The history of the literature is treated in the second volume as follows: Awestalitteratur, by K. F. Geldner; Die altpersischen Inschriften, by F. H. Weissbach; Pahlavi Lit., by E. W. West (in English); Das iranische Nationalepos, by T. Nöldeke; Neupersische Lit., by H. Ethé. Valuable bibliography is cited in all articles. / *P. HORN, Gesch. der persischen Lit. (Leipz.: 1901; Die Lit. des Ostens). / *E. G. BROWNE, Lit. Hist. of Persia (2 vols. Lond.: 1902–1906), — from earliest times to 1250; with bibliography. / *K. GELDNER, Altpersische Lit.; *P. HORN, Mittelpersische und neupersische Lit. (both in Hinneberg's Kultur der Gegenwart, T. I, Abt. VII. Berlin: 1906). / *H. ETHÉ, Art. Modern Persian Lit.; K. GELDNER, Art. Zend-Avesta, — both in Encyc. Brit., 11th ed. (1911). / J. H. MOULTON, Early Religious Poetry of Persia (Cambridge: 1911; Camb. Manuals of Science and Lit.). / E. G. BROWNE, The Press and Poetry of Modern Persia (Cambridge: 1914).

C. *Periodicals*. See above, XXXV, C.

XXXIX. Indian (Sanskrit and Hindoo) Poetry.

A. *Bibliographies.* See above, xxxv, a; also F. Campbell, Index Catalogue of Bibliographical Works relating to India (Lond.: 1897).

B. *Histories.* M. Müller, Hist. of Ancient Sanskrit Lit. (Lond.: 1859; 2d ed. 1860), — Vedic period only. / Garcin de Tassy, Les auteurs hindoustanis et leurs ouvrages (2d ed. Paris: 1868) and Hist. de la litt. hindouie et hindoustanie (3 vols. 2d ed. Paris: 1870–1871). / A. Weber, Hist. of Indian Lit. (trans. from the 2d German ed. by Mann and Zachariae, Lond.: 1878; 1st German ed. 1852). / Sir M. Monier-Williams, Indian Wisdom (Lond.: 1876). / L. von Schroeder, Indiens Lit. und Kultur in historischer Entwicklung (Leipz.: 1887). / G. A. Grierson, The Medieval Vernacular Lit. of Hindustan (Trans. of the 7th Oriental Congress. Vienna: 1888) and The Modern Vernacular Lit. of Hindustan (Calcutta: 1889). / Elizabeth A. Reed, Hindu Lit., etc. (Chicago: 1891), — popular. / R. C. Dutt, Lit. of Bengal (Lond.: 1895). / Bühler and Kielhorn (editors), Grundriss der indo-arischen Philologie und Altertumskunde (3 vols. in many parts. Strassburg: 1896–1912 +), — as yet very little on the literature. / T. W. Rhys Davids, Buddhism, its Hist. and Lit. (Lond.: 1896). / *R. W. Frazer, A Lit. Hist. of India (Lond.: 1898). / *A. A. Macdonell, Hist. of Sanskrit Lit. (Lond.: 1900; Short Hists. of Lits. of the World). / *H. Oldenberg, Die Lit. des alten Indiens (Stuttgart: 1903). / V. Henry, Les litts. de l'Inde (Paris: 1904), — light and sketchy. / *R. Pischel, Die indische Lit. (in Hinneberg's Kultur der Gegenwart, T. I, Abt. VII. 1906). / *M. Winternitz, Gesch. der indischen Lit. (Leipz.: 1908; Die Lit. des Ostens). / *H. J. Eggeling, Art. Sanskrit Lit.; *C. J. Lyall, Art. Hindostani Lit., — both in Encyc. Brit., 11th ed. (1910).

C. *Periodicals.* See above, xxxv, c; / also *Asiatic Soc. of Bengal, Transactions* (Calcutta: 1788–1839) and **Journal* (Calcutta: 1832 +); / *Calcutta Review* (1844 +); / **The Indian Antiquary* (Bombay: 1872 +); / **American Journal of Philology* (Baltimore: 1880 +); / and other periodicals of general scope mentioned above, v, c.

XL. Sumerian and Babylonian Poetry.

A. *Bibliographies.* *H. W. Hogg, Survey of Recent Assyriology (Edinb.: 1908 +; vol. III, 1914, for period 1910–1913). / *I. A. Pratt and R. Gottheil, Assyria and Babylonia, A List of References in the N.Y. Public Library (N.Y.: 1918), — most helpful; see pp. 10–11 for other bibliographies.

B. *Histories.* A. H. Sayce, The Lit. Works of Ancient Babylonia (in *Zeitschr. für Keilschriftforschung*, 1: 187–194. 1884) and Babylonian Lit., Lects. delivered at the Royal Inst. (Lond.: n.d.). / C. Bezold, Kurzgefasster Überblick über die babylonisch-assyrische Lit. (Leipz.: 1886). / M. Jastrow, Religion of Babylonia and Assyria (Boston: 1898). / *B. Teloni, Letteratura assira (Milano: 1903; Manuali Hoepli), — a brief but valuable introduction, with admirable bibliographical notes. / *C. Bezold, Die babylonisch-assyrische Lit. (in Hinneberg's Kultur der Gegenwart, T. I, Abt. VII. 1906). / *O. WEBER, Die Lit. der Babylonier und Assyrer (Leipz.: 1907). / R. W. ROGERS, History of Babylonia and Assyria (N.Y.: 1915).

C. *Periodicals. The Babylonian and Oriental Record* (Lond.: 1886–1901). / **Revue d'assyriologie et d'archéologie orientale* (Paris: 1886 +). / **Zeitschr. für Assyriologie und verwandte Gebiete* (Leipz., etc.: 1886 +), — with bibliography. / Delitzsch and Haupt's *Beiträge zur Assyriologie und vergleichenden semitischen Sprachwissenschaft* (Leipz.: 1890–1913). / See also the periodicals noted above, XXXV, C; and below, XLII, C.

XLI. **Egyptian Poetry.**

A. *Bibliographies.* See above, XXXV, A.

B. *Histories.* In addition to the works cited above, p. 364, see A. ERMAN, Ägypten und ägyptisches Leben (1887), and the volumes on Egyptian literature in the series Books on Egypt and Chaldea (Lond., Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner & Co.).

C. *Periodicals. Zeitschr. für aegyptische Sprache und Altertumskunde* (Leipz.: 1863 +), — with bibliography. / **Recueil de travaux relatifs à la philologie et à l'archéologie égyptiennes et assyriennes* (Paris: 1870 +), — bibliography. / *Journal of the Manchester Egyptian and Oriental Soc.* (1911 +). / See also above, XXXV, C; XL, C.

XLII. **Ancient Hebrew Poetry.**

A. *Bibliographies.* See above, XXXV, A; also the periodicals noted below, C.

B. *Histories.* In addition to the works mentioned above, pp. 364–366, see the following. R. LOWTH, De Sacra Poësi Hebraeorum (Oxford: 1753; ed. by I. D. Michaëlis, Göttingen: 1761; by E. F. C. Rosemüller, Leipz.: 1815; etc.). / J. G. HERDER, Vom Geiste der ebräischen Poesie (1782–1783). / F. DELITZSCH, Zur Gesch. der jüdischen Poesie (Leipz.: 1836). / E. MEIER, Gesch. der poetischen National-Lit. der Hebräer (Leipz.: 1856). / H. EWALD, Die Dichter des alten Bundes (3 vols. Göttingen: 1864–1867). / T. NÖLDEKE, Die alttestamentliche Lit. (Leipz.: 1868). / D. CASSEL, Gesch. der jüdischen Lit. (2 vols. Berlin: 1872–1873). / S. SHARPE, Hist. of the Hebrew Nation and its Lit. (5th ed. Lond.: 1890). / K. BUDDE, Das Volkslied Israels im Munde der Propheten (in *Preuss. Jahrb.* Sept. 1893; *ibid.*, Dec. 1895; cf. *New World*, 1894, p. 56 ff.). / *K. BUDDE, Gesch. der althebräischen Lit. (Leipz.: 1906; Die Lit. des Ostens). / F. K. SANDERS and H. T. FOWLER, Outlines for the Study of Biblical Hist. and Lit. (N.Y.: 1906). / *H. T. FOWLER, A Hist. of the Lit. of Ancient Israel from the Earliest Times to 135 B.C. (N.Y.: 1912).

See also introductions to the Old Testament by Reuss (1890), Baudissin (1901), Cornill (1905), and — the best in English — Driver (cited above,

p. 364; new ed. 1914); *Art. Bible, by Driver and others, in Encyc. Brit., 11th ed. (1910); *Art. Poetical Lit., in Encyc. Biblica.

C. *Periodicals.* **Revue des études juives* (Paris: 1880 +). / **Journal of Biblical Lit.* (Middletown, Conn., etc.: 1881 +). / **Zeitschr. für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* (1881 +). / *The Biblical World* (Chicago: 1882–1898). / **American Journal of Semitic Languages and Lits.* (Chicago: 1884 +), — originally *Hebraica*; with bibliography. / **Revue sémitique d'épigraphie et d'hist. ancienne* (Paris: 1893 +), — with bibliography. / See also above, XXXV, C; XL, C; XLI, C.

XLIII. Chinese Poetry.

A. *Bibliography.* *A. WYLIE, Notes on Chinese Lit. (Shanghai: 1867; new ed. 1901), — including a bibliography of English translations of Chinese classics. / J. EDKINS, Catalogue of Chinese Works in the Bodleian Library (Oxford: 1876). / British Museum, R. K. Douglas, Catalogue of Chinese Printed Books, etc. (Lond.: 1877). / *H. CORDIER, Bibliotheca Sinica, Dictionnaire bibliographique des ouvrages relatifs à l'empire chinois (Paris: 1878; Supplément, 1895; 2d ed. 4 vols. 1904–1908). / *Orientalische bibliographie (Berlin: 1887 +), — supplementing Cordier's great work. / C. MUÑOZ Y MANZANO, CONDE DE LA VIÑAZA, Escritos de los portugueses y castellanos referentes á las linguas de China y el Japón (Lisboa: 1892). / H. A. GILES, Catalogue of the Wade Collection . . . in the Library of Cambridge (Cambridge: 1898; supplement, 1915) and A Chinese Biographical Dictionary (Lond.: 1898). / Bibliothèque nationale, M. Courant, Catalogue des livres chinois, coréens, japonais, etc. (Paris: 1900 +). / See also above, XXXV, A.

B. *Histories.* W. SCHOTT, Entwurf einer Beschreibung der chinesischen Lit. (Berlin: 1854). / *J. LEGGE, The Chinese Classics (7 vols. Lond.: 1861–1885), — translations, introductions, etc. / C. IMBAULT-HUART, La poésie chinoise du 14e au 19e siècle (Paris: 1886). / *H. A. GILES, Hist. of Chinese Lit. (Lond.: 1901; Short Hists. of Lits. of the World). / *W. GRUBE, Gesch. der chinesischen Lit. (Leipz.: 1902; Die Lit. des Ostens) and Die chinesische Lit. (in Hinneberg's Kultur der Gegenwart, T. I, Abt. VII. 1906). / O. HAUSER, Die chinesische Dichtung (Berlin: 1908; Die Lit., ed. G. Brandes, vol. 34), — a brief introduction (67 pp.). / H. A. GILES, Art. Chinese Lit., Encyc. Brit., 11th ed. (1910).

C. *Periodicals.* In addition to those noted above, XXXV, C: *The Chinese Repository* (Canton: 1832–1851). / *Journal of the North-China Branch of the Royal Asiatic Soc.* (Shanghai: 1858 +). / *Chinese Recorder* (Shanghai: 1868 +), — a missionary journal. / *The China Review* (Hong-Kong: 1872 +). / **Variétés sinologiques* (Shanghai: 1892 +), — a series of monographs under the auspices of the Jesuit Fathers at Shanghai. / **Hanoi, Indo-China, École française d'extrême-orient, Bulletin* (Hanoi: 1901 +), *Publications* (Paris: 1901 +).

XLIV. Japanese Poetry.

A. *Bibliographies.* See above, XXXV, A; XLIII, A; also H. CORDIER, Bibliotheca Japonica (Paris: 1912).

B. *Histories.* E. SATOW, Art. Lit. of Japan, American Cyclop. (1874). / G. BOUSQUET, Le Japon litt. (in *Rev. d. deux mondes*, 1878, pp. 747–780). / B. H. CHAMBERLAIN, The Classical Poetry of the Japanese (Lond.: 1880), — texts, etc. / T. O. KASAKI, Gesch. der japanischen Nationallit. (Leipz.: 1899). / *W. G. ASTON, Hist. of Japanese Lit. (Lond.: 1899; Short Hists. of Lits. of the World), — see the review in *Quart. Rev.*, vol. 192. / HITOMI, Le Japon (Paris: 1901). / O. HAUSER, Die japanische Dichtung (Berlin: 1904; Die Lit., ed. G. Brandes, vol. 5), — a brief introduction (68 pp.). / *K. FLORENZ, Gesch. der japanischen Lit. (2 vols. Leipz.: 1905–1906) and Die japanische Lit. (in Hinneberg's Kultur der Gegenwart, T. I, Abt. VII. 1906). / F. V. DICKINS, Primitive and Medieval Japanese Texts (2 vols. Oxford: 1906), — introduction, translations, etc. / F. BRINKLEY, Art. Japanese Lit., Encyc. Brit., 11th ed. (1910). / Y. NOGUCHI, The Spirit of Japanese Poetry (Lond.: 1914; Wisdom of the East Series).

C. *Periodicals.* *Transactions of the Asiatic Soc. of Japan* (Yokohama: 1872 +). / *Transactions and Proceedings of the Japan Society* (Lond.: 1893 +). / *Mitteilungen der deutschen ostasiatischen Gesellschaft* (Yokohama).

INDEX

NOTE. The reference is to pages. Bold-face figures indicate annotated references. Titles of poems, with a few exceptions, and the Appendix have not been indexed. Poems may be traced by authors' names.

Aarestrup, E., 350
Abbo, 691, 699
Abbott, G. F., 188
Abeling, T., 753, 755, 756, 757
Abercrombie, L., 291, 453, 615
Abrahamson, Nyerup, and Rahbek, 345
Abu'l-ala, 356
Acciaiuoli, 235
Achelis, T., 328
Achilleid, theory of an, 628, 635, 672, 673
Achillini, 238
Ackermann, R., 687
Acrostic, 198, 692
Action of the epic, 433–434
Adam de la Halle, 211, 212
Adam le Bossu, 211
Adam of St. Victor, 193, 202
Adam, F., 453, 588
Adam, L., 672
Adams, Jean, 284
Adams, S. H., 329
Adams, W. D., 16, 32, 415
Adamson, J., 735
Addison, J., 115, 116, 117, 280, 281, 285, 286, 288, 322, 341, 417, 426, 429, 453–454, 464, 484, 529, 563, 564, 565, 567, 570, 579, 603, 634, 746
Adler, G. J., 209
Adonis song, 15
Adriano, S., 685
Aedilvulf, 696
Aedituus, 414
Aelian, 669
Aelius Donatus, 515
Aeolic or Lesbian lyric, 184, 190, 377, 417, 418
Aeschylus, 186, 377
Aesop, 638, 701
Aesthetic emotions, 36
Aetiological narrative, 438, 592, 597, 607, 627, 664
Afghan poetry, 355
Agius, 387
Agnelli, G., 243, 717
Agostinho da Cruz, Frei, 263
Ahlwardt, W., 355
Aikin, J., 117, 125, 285, 569
Aikin, Lucy, 285, 569
Ainger, A., 127, 285
Aitken, G. A., 285
Ajuda, Cancioneiro da, 262, 265
Aken, Hein van, 765
Akenside, M., 115, 117, 273, 286, 419
Alaleona, D., 237
Alamanni, A., 235
Alamanni, L., 216, 391, 396, 419, 724
Alba, 16, 210, 315
Albert, H., 318, 319
Albert, P., 110, 145
Albini, G., 722
Albrecht von Johannsdorf, 314
Alcaeus, 184, 418
Alcmaeon, 508
Alcman, 184, 417
Alcover, J., 261
Alcuin, 199, 200, 387, 388, 691, 696, 697
Alden, R. M., 12, 16, 32, 42, 129, 272, 298, 420, 423, 431 *et passim*, 454
Aldini, A., 239
Aldis, H. G., 266
Aleardi, 245
Alexander the Aetolian, 378

Alexander, F., 248
Alexander, H. B., 42
Alexander, Sir W., 561
Alexander, W. J., 299
Alexandrian canon of poets, 86, 511, 513
Alexandrian epic, 473, 680–681; lyric, 5, 27, 186, 189, 190, 376, 378–381
Alfieri, 240, 242–243
Alfius Flavus, 384
Alfonso II of Aragon, 250
Alfonso X of Castile, 253, 255
Alfonso de Baena, J., 251, 254
Alger, W. R., 362
Al Ghazzali, 356
Allaci, L., 226
Allegorical criticism, 426, 465, 484, 510, 511, 518, 520–521, 528, 538, 543, 544, 545, 549, 556, 561, 563, 566, 567, 685
Allegorical narrative, 690–691, 693, 696, 716, 720, 741, 771
Allen, C. F. R., 367
Allen, K., 685
Allen, P. S., 149–150, 311, 314, 333
Allen, T. W., 674, 675, 679
Allen, T. W., and Sikes, E. E., 187
Allen, W. F., 150
Allingham, 294
Almqvist, K. J. L., 772
Alscher, R., 272, 421
Altner, E., 707
Altona, J., 707
Alvarus, 200, 387
Amadis of Gaul, 487, 733
Amador de los Rios, J., 250, 255, 260, 702
Amalfi, G., 248
Amar du Rivier, J. A., 220, 458
Ambros, W. A., 42
Ambrose of Milan, 518, 521
Ameis and Hentze, 678
American (U. S.) poetry, *see* Appendix; *also* 290, 298
Ampère, J. J., 109, 199
Anachronism in the epic, 642
Anacreon, 185, 189, 418, 510
Anacreontic ode, 18, 103, 105, 116, 150, 237, 238, 239, 241, 276, 277, 321, 323, 329, 419
Anatolius, 192
Ancient and Modern Quarrel, 102, 464, 465, 492, 502, 539, 540, 543–544, 545, 547, 548, 550, 551, 561, 562, 563, 564, 669
Anderson, 280
Anderson, J. P., 298
Anderson, R. B., 339, 769
Anderton, I. M., 620
Andreini, 746
Andrelinus, 649
Andres, G., 534–535
Aneau, 101
Angellier, A., 285
Angeloni, I. M., 230
Angermann, A., 315
Angilbert, 388, 697
Angioleri, Cecco, 231
Anglade, J., 205, 208, 209
Angus, W. C., 285
Animal folk tales, 623, 624, 627, 663, 701
Animals, Laments for pet, 402–403
Anonymous traditional poetry, 428–429, 441, 443, 605–608, 621, 623, 629, 640, 642, 671
Anquetil du Perron, 359
Ansellus, 691, 699
Anslo, R., 766
Anthology, Greek, 64, 186, 188, 413–414
Anthology, Roman, 413
Anthropological study of poetry, *see* Lower races, poetry of; *also* 620, 649, 660
Antimachus of Colophon, 378, 457
ἀοιδοί, 594
Apollinaris Sidonius, 89
Apollonius, 453
Apollonius of Rhodes, 464, 516, 534, 569, 593, 601, 680–681, 683, 685
Appel, C., 205
Appleton, W. H., 188
Arabian poetry, 150, 166, 206, 355–356, 486, 644
Arany, J., 354
Arator, 690, 695
Aratus, 379
Arbaud, D., 225
Arber, 266

Arbois de Jubainville, 306, 677, 748, 749
Arbuthnot, 356
Arcadia Ulysiponense, 264
Arcadian Academy, 94, 239–243, 264 (Portuguese), 397
Arcadian poetry, *see* Arcadian Academy; *also* 380, 444, 530
Archer, W., 128, 291, 299
Archilochus, 184, 188, 376
Ardito, 97
Ardwisson, 340
Arent, W., 332
Arentzen, K., 352
Aretino, 724
Arici, 244
Arion, 184, 186
Ariosto, L., 204, 237, 396, 426, 463, 479, 487, 490, 500, 505, 507, 522, 524, 525, 526, 529, 530, 531, 533, 534, 536, 544, 550, 557, 561, 568, 569, 578, 583, 588, 599, 651, 712, 720, 721, 723–725 (editions and translations, 724), 726, 729, 745
Aristarchus, 453, 511, 514, 667
Aristophanes, 186, 521
Aristophanes of Byzantium, 511, 514
Aristotle, 42–43, 86, 90, 91, 100, 137, 425, 427 *et passim*, 453, 454, 458, 460, 463, 465, 466–467, 475, 477, 482, 486, 490, 491, 492, 494, 501, 509, 513, 516, 522, 523–524, 525, 526, 527, 528, 529, 530, 531, 533, 537, 538, 539, 541, 542, 546, 551, 552, 556, 557, 559, 561, 563, 564, 565, 566, 570, 578, 584, 587, 589, 634, 725
Armenian poetry, 355, 783
Armes, W. D., 440, 442, 455, 746
Armstrong, J., 611
Armstrong, W. H., 661
Arnauld, A., 492
Arndt, A., 685
Arndt, E. M., 331, 333
Arnim, L. J. (A.) von, 331, 333
Arnim and Brentano, 336
Arnobius, 517, 692
Arnold, Sir Edwin, 295, 433, 435, 488, 603, 748
Arnold, E. V., 363
Arnold, M., 34, 122, 127, 138, 286, 290 ff., 307, 329, 334, 405, 406, 418, 455–456, 493, 572, 574, 679, 704, 742
Arnold, R. F., and Wagner, K., 330
Arnolletus, 649
Arnould, L., 541
Aronstein, B., 299
Arragonia, V. Toraldo da, 92
Arrebo, A., 346, 351, 771, 772
Arrowsmith, R., 362
Arruntius Stella, 384
Arsilli, 204
Art ballad, 442–443
Art-instinct, theories of, 142
Art lyric, 15, 142, 144, 151, 153, 158, 160, 168, 592–593
Arte de trobar, 251
Arthurian romance, 473, 487, 491, 555, 560, 635, 710–711, 741–744, 748, 751, 763, 765
Arullani, V. A., 241
Ascham, R., 111–112, 555
Asselineau, C., 25, 218, 420
Aston, W. G., 368
Athenagoras the Athenian, 519
Atherstone, E., 439
Atkinson, J., 776
Atterbom, P. D. A., 343, 345, 771
Aubades, 392
Aube, 207
Aubertin, C., 615
Aubry, P., 209, 213
Aubry, P., and Jeanroy, A., 212
Audin, E., 721
Audrad, 388
Auger, 220
Auguis, 206
Aulus Gellius, 87, 515, 523
Aurelius Nemesianus, 384–385
Ausfeld, F., 150, 329
Ausonius, 87, 198, 384, 399, 415, 515
Aust, J., 150, 270
Austin, A., 290, 295, 299, 575
Autels, G. des, 101
Authorship, epic, 428–429
Aveling, C., 209, 213
Avenarius, F., 330, 332
Avitus, 690, 694
Ayres, H. M., 266, 736, 740

Aytoun, 296
Azarias, Brother, 127, 574, 717
Azzolina, L., 230

Bååth, A. U., 344
Babbitt, I., 106, 456, 541, 554
Babois, 400
Babylonian poetry, 363, 782–783
Bacchylides, 185, 188, 189, 418
Baccini, G., 243
Bacelli, 245
Bachmann, W., 511
Bacon, Francis, 43, 540, 560, 561, 569
Bacon, L., 353, 704, 731–732, 775
Baculard d'Arnaud, 399
Badke, O., 226
Bächtold, J., 326, 334
Bähr, J. C. F., 689
Baehrens, E., 190, 381
Baena's Cancionero, 254
Baerlein, H., 356
Bärnstein, 202
Baethgen, D. F., 365
Bäumker, W., 336
Bagehot, W., 125, 126, 299, 574, 746
Bagger, C. C., 350
Baggesen, A., 352, 772
Baggesen, J., 348–349, 350, 352
Bagnole, P., 729
Bahder, K. von, 309
Baïf, J. de, 217, 218, 398
Bailey, J., 746
Bailey, John, 456
Bailey, P. J., 294, 295
Baillet, A., 544
Baillie, Joanna, 284
Baillie, J. B., 476
Bailly, E., 764
Baist, G., 732, 733
Balaguer, V., 255, 732
Balart, F., 260, 410
Balbus, 415
Balde, E., 329
Baldelli, G. B., 95
Baldi, A., 335
Baldwin, C. S., 268, 738, 741
Baldwin, J. M., 43
Ballad, 25, 112, 118, 125, 225, 255, 277, 285, 296, 327, 336, 340, 344, 345–346, 353, 367, 406, 423, 428, 439, 440–443 (manner, verse, subject-matter, kinds, definition), 449, 455, 460, 462, 470, 472, 473, 474, 476, 478, 480, 482, 483, 486, 489, 496, 498, 500, 503, 505, 564, 582, 589, 594, 595, 598, 604, 605–609 (origin, distribution, development, relation to other types), 615, 620, 622, 626, 628–629, 632, 633, 639, 642, 643, 646–647, 653, 656, 657–658, 731, 732, 742, 749, 750, 754, 766, 772, 773–774, 775
Ballad and epic, interrelation, 589, 598, 604, 609, 628, 631–632, 633, 634, 636, 638, 643, 663, 731, 733, 738, 739, 763, 767, 774
Ballade, 16, 154, 210, 214, 269, 270
Ballate, 16, 226, 229
Ballettes, 16, 207
Balzac, J. G. de, 103, 542
Bandello, M., 238
Banning, A., 738
Banville, T. de, 16, 129, 222
Baptista Mantuanus, 610, 649
Barante, P. B. de, 109
Barbey, D'Aurevilly, J. A., 110
Barbour, J., 744
Bardenhewer, O., 692
Bardoux, A., 223
Baret, E., 205, 255, 732, 733
Baretti, M. G., 94, 242, 243, 530
Bargeo, Pietro, 395
Barham, 295
Barine, A., 223
Baring-Gould, S., 127
Barlow, Jane, 290
Barlow, Joel, 748
Barnard, Lady Anne, 284
Barnes, B., 272
Barnes, J., 116
Barnes, W., 294, 295, 452
Baron, A. H. N., 601
Barrès, M., 224
Barreto, M., 265
Barrett, W. A., 126, 215, 273
Barta, F., 87
Bartels, Adolf, 309 *et passim*, 330
Barth, A., 780
Barth, C. von, 203, 576

Barthold, 321
Bartholomae, C., 360
Bartholomew, A. T., and Clark, J. W., 567
Bartoli, A., 97, 226, 227, 534, 702
Barton, W. E., 150
Bartrina, J. M., 260
Bartsch, K., 201, 206, 208, 209, 211, 213, 312, 315, 610, 706, 707, 756, 759, 761, 762
Bartsch and Horning, 213
Barzellotti, G., 246
Basia, 203–204
Basile, G. B., 92
Basini, B., 720
Basselin, O., 214
Bastard, 416
Batista, G., 93
Batteux, C., 44, 433 *et passim*, 456, 503, 552–553, 578
Battifol, 519
Baudelaire, 222, 245, 400
Baudoin, J., 559
Bauer, E. A. L., 333
Bauer, R., 704
Baumgart, H., 134, 150, 433 *et passim*, 457, 458
Baumgarten, A., 133, 580, 581, 585
Baumgarten, B., 705
Baumgartner, A., 192, 355, 356, 360, 364, 368, 682, 702, 780, 783
Baumstark, A., 188
Bauquier, J., 703
Bayle, P., 492, 539
Bayne, P., 44, 126
Bayne, T., 44
Bayne, W., 286
Bazzoni, G., 615
Beast epic, 623–624, 701, 711, 750, 763, 783
Beattie, J., 287, 405, 611
Beatty, A., 607, 616, 647
Beaumont, J., 276, 277, 404, 405
Beaunier, A., 224
Beaurepaire-Froment, 225
Beccari, A., 610
Becelli, G. C., 94, 532
Bech, F., 761
Bechstein, R., 761
Beck, J. B., 209
Becker, E., 699
Becker, N., 331
Becker, P. A., 205, 212, 698
Becker, R., 315
Beddoes, T. L., 294, 296
Bede, 89, 193
Bédier, J., 212, 616, 624, 698, 704, 707, 711
Bédier, J., and Roques, M., 170
Beeching, H. C., 25, 44, 129, 273, 283, 421
Beers, H. A., 46, 124, 150, 286, 299
Begg, W. P., 127, 676, 685
Behagel, O., 761
Beheim, M., 317, 319
Bekker, I., 676, 678, 682, 704, 707
Belcari, Feo, 236
Belger, C., 161
Beljame, A., 286
Bell, A. F. G., 735
Bell, M., 299
Bellay, *see* Du Bellay
Belleau, Remi, 217
Bellermann, C. F., 265
Belli, 244
Bellincioni, B., 396
Belling, H., 381, 685
Bellman, K. M., 342, 344
Bello, A., 730
Belloni, A., 92, 236, 238, 239, 527, 528, 712, 727
Bellunese, G. C., 528
Belsham, W., 457, 570
Beltrami, A., 188
Belzner, E., 676
Bembo, 203, 237, 391, 396, 415
Bénard, C., 58
Benecke, 312
Benecke, E. F. M., 457–458, 685
Benedetti, 244
Benedict, S., 759
Beneducci, F., 463
Beni, P., 523, 524, 528, 529, 541, 543, 669
Benivieni, 236, 396
Benkowitz, C. F., 764
Benlowes, E., 439
Benoist, 187
Benoit, F., 286
Bensley, E., 286
Benson, A. C., 127, 290, 299
Bentfield, C. A., 685

Bentley, R., 492, 563, 564, 566–567, 667, 669
Beowulf, 429, 481, 482, 571, 585, 593, 595, 657, 660, 736–739 (editions and translations, 738), 754
Béranger, 125, 222, 223, 400
Bérard, V., 672, 676
Berardi, C., 90, 93
Berchet, G., 96, 244, 246
Berdoe, E., 299
Bérenger de la Tour, 398
Bergaigne, 362
Berger, A. E., 151
Berger, P., 286
Bergerat, É., 223
Bergk, T., 187, 376, 672, 675
Bergmann, J., 336
Bergson, H., 224
Bern, M., 330
Bernagge, S., 188
Bernard of Morlaix, 193
Bernard, 220
Bernard, J. H., and Atkinson, R., 307
Bernardes, Diego, 263, 410
Bernardin de Saint-Pierre, 107
Bernays, M., 326
Bernhardy, G., 44, 85, 376, 458, 588, 672, 675
Berni, F., 729
Bernis, F. J. P., 220, 399
Bernoni, G., 248
Bertana, E., 243, 246
Bertharius, 388
Berthelin, E., 218
Bertin, 220, 400
Bertòla, A., 241, 243, 395, 397
Bertòla, G., 395
Bertoni, G., 209, 227, 229, 230, 231, 722
Bertoni, G., and Vicini, E. P., 234
Bertran de Born, 208
Bertrand, E., 685
Bertrand, L., 611
Bertrin, G., 672
Besant, 213, 217
Besser, J. von, 322
Bethe, E., 679
Bethge, H., 330, 367
Bethge, R., 310
Bettinelli, S., 94, 242, 532
Betz and Baldensperger, 211, 334, 354, 710, 711, 719, 741, 748, 761
Bever, A. van, and Léautaud, P., 107, 222
Beyer, C., 333, 589
Beyer, V., 443
Bezold, C., 363, 782
Biadene, L., 230, 420
Bianco da Siena, 233
Biava, 244
Bibbiena, Cardinal di, 235
Biblical paraphrase, 195, 197
Biblioteca italiana, 96
Bickersteth, E. H., 433, 574
Bickersteth, G. L., 247
Biedermann, K., 327
Biedermann, W. von, 141, 151, 373, 616
Bielfeld, J. F. von, 131, 578
Bielschowsky, A., 329
Bierbaum, O. J., 332
Biese, A., 44–45, 135, 183, 188, 309, 330, 676, 685, 738
Biese, F., 589
Biffoli, B. de', 236
Biggs, Maude A., 775
Bijns, Anna, 337
Bilderdijk, W., 338, 766
Billings, A. H., 741
Billson, C. J., 352, 687, 774
Bindi, E., and Fanfani, P., 230
Binet, A., 711
Binet, H., 209
Bintz, J., 130
Binyon, L., 290, 742
Bion, 186, 379, 380, 391, 483, 610, 649
Biondi, 244
Birch-Hirschfeld, A., 204, 207, 709
Biré, E., 110, 223
Birken, S. von, 130, 321, 577
Birrell, A., 299, 574
Bistrom, W., 616, 775
Bitaubé, P. J., 552
Bithell, J., 312
Bittner, M., 355
Björnson, B., 351, 773
Black, J., 573
Black, W., 286
Blackburn, 740
Blackie, J. S., 151, 286, 296, 676

Blackmore, Sir R., 439, **563**, 566, 742, 766
Blackwell, T., 533, 553, 565, 582, 584, 594, 600, **616–617**, 634, 667, 668, 670, 672, 678
Bladé, J. F., 225
Blair, H., 45, 118, 286, 423, 458, 533, **570**, 611
Blair, R., 282, 397, 399, 405
Blake, W., 77, 284, 286, 287, 288, 289, 295, 297, 300
Blakeney, E. H., 678
Blanchemain, P., 536
Blankenburg, F. von, **76**, 458, **499** *et passim*
Blass, F., **617**, 672
Blaze de Bury, H., 109
Bleek, A., 359
Bleibtreu, K., 332, 335
Blind, Mathilde, 290, 295
Blochmann, H., 361
Blodget, H., 361
Blommaert, 337
Blondel de Nesle, 211, 212
Bloomfield, M., 361, 362
Bloomfield, R., 295
Blount, T. P., 562
Blume, L., 754
Boas, F., 371, 373, 593
Boccaccio, 391, 468, 521, 526, 719–721
Boccalini, T., 92, **528**
Bode, K., 443
Bodenstedt, F., 331, 332, 334, 358
Bodmer, J. J., 129, 130–131, 322, 323, 325, 326, 331, 347, 408, 409, 432, 433, 460, 578, 579, 580
Böckel, O., 45, 617
Boeckh, A., 45, 151, 376, 588, 617
Böcking, E., 496
Böddeker, K., 268
Bödtcher, L. A., 350
Böhl de Faber, 734
Böhm, F., 754
Böhme, F. M., 320, 336
Böhtlingk, 590
Bömer, A., 202
Boer, R. C., 738, 756
Boerkel, A., 315
Boethius, 386, 388
Bötticher, G., 762
Böttiger, K. V., 344
Bogaers, A., 338, 766
Bogdanovich, I. F., 353
Bohemian poetry, *see* Cheskian
Bohm, W., 321
Bohn, W. E., 563
Bohse, P., 676
Boiardo, M., 236, 426, 463, 490, 500, 507, 522, 525, 651, 712, 721–723 (editions and translations, 722), 726, 729
Boileau-Despréaux, N., 102–104, 131, 138, 219, 259, 323, 347, 399, 416, 426, 434 *et passim*, **458–459**, 463, 492, 496, 535, 537, 539, 540, 541, 542, 543, 551, 553, 558, 562, 579, 587, 603, 712, 763, 772
Boisrobert, F. Le M. de, 492
Boissier, G., 199, **617–618**, 685, 689
Boivin, J., 545, **548**
Bolle, W., 273, 274
Bolton, E., 556, 560, 561
Bolton, T. L., 124
Bolza, G. B., 723
Bolza, J. B. (= G. B.), 724
Bond, R. W., 724
Bongioanni, A., 230
Bonichi, Bindo, 233
Bonitz, H., 672
Bonnard, Chevalier de, 400
Bonvecino of Riva, 228
Borgese, G. A., 95, 247
Borghesi, P., 273, 421
Borinski, K., 129, 317, 321, 575, 577, 699, 717
Born, S., 333
Borrow, G. H., 308
Borthwick, J. D., 286
Bortolotti, V., 242
Borzelli, A., 237, 239
Bosanquet, B., 86, 130, 132, 496
Boscan, J., 254, 256, 257, 258, 410
Bossert, A., 752
Bossuet, J. B., **544**, 622
Boswell, C. S., 748
Bottomley, G., 291, 295
Bouchard, M. A., 105
Bouchard, P. de, 224
Boufflers, 220
Bougot, A., 672, 685
Bouhours, D., 492, **544**

Boulting, W., 727
Bourget, P., 108, 110, 299
Bourgoin, A., 102, 459, 542
Bournouf, E., 361
Bouterwek, 261
Bouvy, E., 243
Bovet, E., 151
Bowles, W. L., 124, 283, 284, 286, 296, 405
Bowring, J., 337, 352, 353, 354, 733, 775
Boyle, Charles, 492, 563, 564
Boynton, H. W., 299
Boynton, P. H., 290
Bracciolini, F., 728, 729
Bracciolini, P., 719–720
Bradley, A. C., 38, 128, 299
Bradley, C. B., 430, 453, 459–460, 594, 596, 684
Braga, T., 254, 261, 264, 265, 734, 735, 783
Brahm and Bölsche, 335
Braitmaier, F., 130, 460, 578, 579, 588
Brakelmann, J., 211, 212
Brandão, D., 263
Brandelius, J. C., 32
Brandenburg, Kurfürstin von, 319
Brandes, G., 221, 223, 289–290, 299, 333, 345, 350, 354
Brandi, G. B., 528
Brandl, A., 266, 270, 286, 299, 736, 738
Brandstetter, R., 783
Brandt, P., 188
Braun, A. D. von, 344
Braun, D., 354
Braune, W., 317, 753
Braunschvig, M., 550
Bray, J. W., 128, 266
Bréal, M., 598, 672
Breasted, J. H., 356, 364
Brederoo, G. A., 338
Brehaut, E., 518
Breitinger, J. J., 130, 323, 408, 460, 578, 579
Brenner, O., 752
Brentano, C., 331, 333
Brerewood, F., 547
Breton, N., 272, 611
Breul, K., 309, 759
Bridges, R., 290, 294 ff., 418, 420, 747
Briggs, E. G., 365
Brimley, G., 127, 299
Brinton, A. C., 221
Brite, D. de, 263
Brito-Aranha, 734
Brittany, poetry of, *see* Appendix; *also* 306–309
Brockelmann, C., 356
Brockes, B. H., 322, 323
Brockhaus, F. A., 135, 249, 322, 460, 604
Brodeur, A. G., 769
Brofferio, 244
Broglé, H., 611, 614, 618
Bronson, W. C., 21, 127, 286
Brooke, Charlotte, 307
Brooke, Rupert, 291, 297
Brooke, S. A., 126, 128, 286, 299, 738, 746
Broome, W., 566
Brorson, H. A., 347
Brotanek, R., 528
Brough, 295
Brown, A. C. L., 710
Brown, J., 117
Brown, Simon, 283
Browne, C., 286
Browne, E. G., 356, 357, 776, 777
Browne, H., 668, 672
Browne, W., 276, 278, 611, 647
Browning, Elizabeth B., 290 ff.
Browning, R., 34, 45–46, 125 ff., 138, 286, 290 ff., 418
Brownlie, J., 194
Bruce, J. D., 744
Bruchmann, K., 46, 134, 141, 152, 431 *et passim*, 460, 587, 618
Brückner, A., 353, 354, 774
Brueckner, G., 704
Bruinier, J. W., 618
Brulé, Grace, 211
Brunck, R. F. P., 187
Brunetière, F., 46, 47, 98, 99, 102, 108, 110, 123, 141, 145, 152, 220, 221, 459, 536, 618 *et passim*
Bruni, L., 204, 521
Brunn, H. von, 676
Brunnhofer, H., 361
Bruno, G., 526–527, 529

Brunot, F., 102
Bryant, Jacob, 286
Bryant, W. C., 678
Brydges, E., 111
Buchanan, G., 415, 418
Buchanan, R. (T. Maitland), 126, 290, 295, 299
Buchenau, G., 320
Bucherer, F., 187
Buchheim, K. A., 310
Buchholz, E., 187, 676
Buchner, Aug., 577
Buchner, W., 310
Bucke, C., 286
Buckingham, Duke of, *see* Mulgrave, Earl of
Bucolic poetry, *see* Pastoral
Budd, C., 367
Budde, K., 364, 411, 412
Budge, E. A. Wallis, 364
Bücheler and Riese, 190
Bücher, 373
Bücher, K., 152
Bühler, G., 780
Bühler and Kielhorn, 361, 778
Bürger, G. A., 325, 327, 443
Bürger, R., 382
Bürkner, R., 633
Bütnner, H., 624
Buff, 746
Buffier, Père C., 492, 548
Bugge, S., 346, 752, 768, 769
Bugnyon, P., 398
Bujeaud, J., 225
Bullen, A. H., 174, 273, 278
Bullinger, H., 576
Bunge, R., 230, 420
Bunsen, Baron von, 336
Buonamici, F., 527
Buonarroti, Michelangelo, 237
Burchiello, 233, 236
Burckhardt, J., 713
Burdach, K., 316, 317
Burden, ballad, 440
Burges, G., 188
Burlesque epic, *see* Mock-heroic epic
Burlesque romance, 439
Burmann, 413
Burne-Jones, Ed., and Lady, 299
Burnouf, E., 676
Burns, R., 120, 125 ff., 144, 284, 285, 286, 287, 288, 405, 447, 452, 611
Burton, R., 267, 574, 735
Bury, J. B., 21, 679
Busetto, N., 247
Busse, C., 330
Busse, K., 135
Bustico, G., 243
Butcher, S., 36, 38, 432 *et passim*, 454, 460–461, 513
Butcher and Lang, 679
Butler, A. J., 713, 714, 715
Butler, E. D., 354
Butler, H. E., 191, 381, 687
Butler, S., 676
Butti, A., 243
Buvalelli, Rambertino, 227
Bylíny, 774
Byrom, J., 115, 611
Byron, Lord, 260, 290 ff., 334, 405
Bysshe, E., 116
Bywater, I., 559
Byzantine poetry, 191, 682

Cabestanh, Guilhem de, 210
Caedmon, 473, 693, 740, 746, 747
Caesar, C. I., 376
Cahier and Martin, 624
Cailly, J. de, 416
Caine, T. H., 47, 290, 299
Caliari, P., 248
Callières, F. de, 492
Callimachus, 186, 188, 189, 379, 380, 414, 453, 667
Callinus, 184, 376
Calpurnius Siculus, 384–385, 610
Calverley, 295
Calvert, G. H., 299
Calvi, E., 233
Calvo, Bonifacio, 227
Calvus, 382
Camboulin, F. R., 249
Cambridge Hist. of Eng. Lit., 152, 265 *et passim*
Camerarius, J., 576, 669
Cameron, A., 308
Camilli, C., 728
Caminha, Pero de Andrade, 263, 410
Camoens, L. de, 263, 410, 458, 496, 554, 734–735

Camp, M. du, 223
Campanella, 239
Campanini, N., 236
Campbell of Islay, 308
Campbell, J. D., 299
Campbell, L., 461, 676
Campbell, T., 294, 296, 573
Campbell, W., 266, 290
Campenon, 712
Campion, T., 113, 276, 279, 560
Campoamor, 260
Canadian poetry, *see* Appendix; *also* 290
Cancellieri, F., 718
Cancioneiro Geral, 262–263, 410, 735
Cancioneros, 251–255, 410, 733
Canello, U. A., 206, 208, 246
Canevari, E., 239
Canfield, A. G., 205
Canitz, R. von, 322, 419
Canning, 295
Cannizzaro, 245
Cansos, 392
Cantares de gesta, 250, 730
Canti carnascialeschi, 235, 236
Canti nazionali, 16
Cantigas de amor e de amigo, 252, 262
Cantigas de escarnho e de maldizer, 252–253
Cantilenas, 731
Cantilene, 226, 229
Cantilènes, 594–595, 615, 625, 635
Cantú, C., 246
Canzone, 157, 210, 228 ff., 237 ff., 256, 395, 418
Capalbo, F., 727
Capdoill, Ponz de, 208
Capetti, V., 718
Capitolo, 395, 396
Capriano, Bresciano, G. P., 522
Caravelli, V., 239
Cardona, E., 249
Carducci, G., 97, 152, 204, 206, 226, 230, 232, 235, 239, 240, 243, 244, 245, 247, 395, 397, 534, 724
Carew, 276
Carini, I., 241
Carlén, J. G., 344
Carlo della Lenguueglia, 395
Carlyle, T., 121, 286, 299, 329, 461, 757
Carmina Burana, 195, 201–202, 208, 227, 269, 315, 394; *cf.* Convivial lyric
Carnoy, H., 225
Caro, 237
Caro, E. M., 110
Carol, the, 154, 269, 270
Carolingian renaissance, 199
Carpenter, F. I., 153, 265, 421, 744
Carpenter, W. B., 718
Carr, 742
Carrara, E., 618
Carrer, L., 236, 244, 245
Carriere, M., 47–48, 134, 139, 145, 153, 376, 412, 418, 427 *et passim*, 462, 496, 503, 583, 587, 619, 759
Carrington, H., 205
"Carroll, Lewis" (Dodgson, C. L.), 296
Carroll, M., 454
Carruth, W. H., 629
Cartaud de la Vilate, 492
Carter, F., 759
Carvajales, 252
Cary, E. L., 299
Cary, H. F., 217
Casa, Giov. della, 237
Casaburi, P., 395
Casartelli, L. C., 359
Casaubon, I., 669
Case, R. H., 128, 153, 273
Casini, T., 230
Cassander, G., 194
Cassi, 244
Casson, T. E., 124, 286
Cassoni, G., 419
Castelain, M., 561
Castelar, E., 299
Castelvetro, L., 426, 490, 522, 523, 524, 525–526, 541, 542, 568
Castets, F., 230, 707, 723
Casti, G. B., 241, 395
Castiglione, 391
Castilho, A. F. de, 264
Castilian poetry, *see* Spanish poetry
Catalan poetry, *see* Spanish poetry
Catalina, M., 258

Catharsis, epic, 437, 463, 501, 506, 552, 567, 586; lyric, 38–39, 56, 83, 84, 506
Catrou, F., 549, 567
Cats, J., 338
Catullus, 190, 191, 203, 227, 245, 276, 381, 382, 394, 414, 415, 418
Catulus, 382, 414
Cauer, F., 685
Cauer, P., 672, 676
Cavalcanti, G., 228, 230, 231
Cavallotti, 245
Caw, 280, 284
Caxton, W., 687, 689, 744
Cayley, C. B., 678
Cayrol, 220
Cecco Angioleri, 231
Cejador y Franca, D. J., 248
Celtes, C., 129, 203, 415, 417, 418
Celtic poetry, 306–309, 402, 748–749
Cento, 518, 693, 694
Cercamon, 208
Cerquand, 624
Cerrato, 187
Cervantes, 255, 734
Cesareo, G. A., 226, 227, 229, 245, 724
Cesarotti, M., 240, 532–533, 662, 672
Cestre, C., 300
Ceva, T., 241
Chabaneau, C., 208
Chabanon, 552
Chadwick, H. M., 595, 597, 598, 599, 600, 619–620, 676, 704, 754
Chalcondylas, D., 678
Chalmers, A., 266, 280 *et passim*
Chamard, H., 101, 218, 535
Chamberlain, A. F., 374
Chamberlain, B. H., 368, 415
Chamberlayne, W., 439
Chambers, 280
Chambers, E. K., 128, 270, 273, 451, 462, 610, 611, 614
Chambers, E. K., and Sidgwick, F., 128, 153, 268
Chamisso, A. von, 331, 333
Champault, P., 676
Champfleury and Wekerlin, 225
Champion, P., 214
Chanson, 16, 106, 153, 178, 179, 207 ff., 439
Chansons de geste, 481, 500, 594–595, 596, 615, 616, 618, 625, 635, 703–708
Chant intérieur, 11
Chant-royal, 16, 214
Chapelain, J., 486, 538, 539, 540, 541–542, 562, 601, 622, 712
Chapman, G., 274, 455, 557, 558, 560, 678
Chappell, W., 273
Characters of the epic, 434–435, 441, 457, 458, 460–461, 470, 471, 473, 482, 485, 489–490, 496, 497, 500, 501, 502, 503, 507, 539, 572, 574, 586, 599, 601, 602, 631, 691, 755
Charlanne, L., 219
Charlemagne, schools of, 696, 697
Charles d'Orléans, 214
Charles, Mrs., 194
Charlton, H. B., 525
Charms, 311, 371–373, 376
Chartier, Alain, 214
Chastellux, F. J. de, 106
Chateaubriand, F. R. A., Vicomte de, 107, 223, 747
Chatterton, T., 283, 286, 287, 288, 289
Chaucer, G., 269, 270, 274, 283, 402, 468, 555, 556, 557, 560, 561, 573, 720, 744
Chaulieu, 399
Chaussard, 29
Chaytor, H. J., 205, 207, 209, 229, 250, 270, 315, 729
Chelakowsky, 354
Chelidonisma, 15, 189
Chênedollé, 221, 400
Chénier, A. de, 29, 106, 220–221, 400, 554
Chénier, M. J., 220, 400, 416
Cherbuliez, V., 727
Cheskian (Bohemian) poetry, 353–354, 775
Chesterton, G. K., 291, 300
Chevalier, U., 194, 706
Cheyne, T. K., and Black, J. S., 365
Chézy, A. L., 780
Chabrera, G., 238, 239, 242, 396, 419, 728

Chiarini, G., 97, 231, 245, 247, 397
Chiaro, Molinaro del, 248
Chichmaref, 214
Child, F. J., 462, 597, 608 *et passim*, 620, 630, 632, 701
Child, H. H., 273, 286, 421
Chinese poetry, 367–368
Chipolla, 227
Chislett, W. J., 184, 191
Chivalry, 568, 726, 728, 751, 761–763
Chodzko, A., 360
Cholmeley, R. J., 451, 462, 614
Choral song, 142, 144, 160, 172, 177, 184, 189, 418, 449, 653, 654
Chorizontes, 667, 669
Chorus, ballad, 440, 607, 628
Chrétien de Troyes, 211, 313
Christ, W. von, 85, 154, 375, 381, 446, 672, 678
Christ, W., and Paranikas, M., 194
Christen, Ada, 332
Christian apology and dogma, references, 689
Christian Greek and Latin poetry, 191–204, 681–682, 688–702
Christian religion and the epic, 426, 433, 458, 463, 473, 476, 493, 501, 525, 537, 539, 542–543, 544, 546, 549, 552, 553, 554, 559, 562, 566, 573, 582, 622, 693, 700, 737, 740–741, 746, 763–764, 773, 775
Christine de Pisan, 214
Chronicle, versified, 691, 696, 698–699
Church, R. W., 714, 744
Churton, E., 258
Ch'ü Yüan, 368
Ciampolini, 727
Cian, V., 230, 243
Cicero, 87, 515, 669
Cid, Poema del, 487, 571, 593, 602, 653, 729–733 (editions and translations, 731–732)
Cieco (i.e. Francesco Bello), 651
Cigala, Lanfranco, 227
Cino da Pistoia, 228, 230, 395
Cinquini, A., 236
Cintio, G., 426 *et passim*, 462–463, 490, 525, 526, 542, 568
Cionacci, F., 236
Cisorio, L., 385
Citharode, 186
Ciullo (or Cielo) d'Alcamo (or dal Camo or Carno), 229, 231
Civilizing power of poetry, 521–522, 533
Clare, 295
Clark, A. C., 203, 446, 614
Clark, J., 431, 463, 620, 735, 736, 747, 757
Clark, J. R., 736
Clark, T., 363
Clarke, B., 732
Clarke, F., 287
Clarke, G. H., 291
Clarus, L., 250
Classical literature, its influence on later lits., 184, 189, 190, 195–197, 216, 218, 234, 237, 238–239, 252, 255, 257, 271, 276, 294, 296, 315, 316, 317, 320, 325, 338, 341, 376–377, 383, 385, 387, 388, 390–391, 392–393, 394, 395, 396, 400, 406, 407–408, 416, 417, 418–419, 425, 475, 649, 692–693, 696, 700, 701, 709–710, 711, 716, 719–721, 722, 723–724, 725–726, 746, 747; *see also* Classicism, Horace, Ovid, Tibullus, Propertius, Virgil, Homer, Pindar, Anacreon, etc.
Classicism, 66–96, 100–107, 108, 119, 120, 130–131, 215 ff., 238, 242–243, 244, 245, 246–247, 259–260, 262–263, 264, 276, 281 ff., 294, 318, 323, 338, 341–342, 398, 400, 425–427, 465, 522–533, 535–545, 556–570, 571, 572, 576–581, 590, 763, 766, 771; *see also* Classical literature, its influence, etc.
Claudian, 190, 198, 688
Claudius, M., 325, 327
Claveau, A., 223
Clawson, W. H., 609, 620, 632
Clédat, L., 209
Clement of Alexandria, 519
Clément, J. M.-B., 106, 553
Clément, L., 218
Clementi, S., 367
Clerke, A., 676
Clichteveus, 194

Clough, A. H., 34, 125, 290 ff.
Cobb, W. H., 364, 366
Cocchia, E., 247
Codrus, 384
Cohen, H. L., 154
Coimbran dispute, 264
Colardeau, 399
Cole, S. V., 194
Colebrook, H. T., 361–362
Coleridge, E. H., 300
Coleridge, E. P., 681
Coleridge, Hartley, 294, 296, 433, 463
Coleridge, S. T., 29, 118, 120, 125, 235, 284, 290 ff., 420, 443, 463, 566, 572
Collection de contes et chansons populaires, 154
Colletet, G., 452
Collins, J. C., 184, 286, 300
Collins, Mortimer, 295
Collins, W., 282, 285, 286, 287, 289, 419, 420, 611
Collinus, R., 576
Collison-Morley, L., 93, 95, 243, 532, 534, 729
Colocchi-Brancuti, 254, 265
Colomb de Batines, 713
Colonna, Vittoria, 237, 238, 396
Columbus, S., 341
Coluthus, 682
Colvin, S., 300
Combarieu, J., 42, 110
Comfort, W. W., 575
Commodianus, 517, 692
Communal, or folk, vs. individual authorship, 160, 161, 372, 507, 531, 533, 571, 592, 597, 605–608, 615, 623, 629, 632, 633, 639, 654, 658
Comos, 186
Comparetti, D., 352, 468, 534, 604, 609, 620–621, 640, 685, 690, 709, 718, 774
Complaints, 402, 403, 404; *see also* Elegy
Composite or agglutinative method of composition, theory of, *see Lieder-Theorie*
Comte, C., and Laumonier, P., 218
Concari, T., 93, 240
Conciliatore, 96
Congreve, W., 22, 116, 419
Conington, J., 286, 610, 687
Conon de Béthune, 211
Conradi, H., 332, 335
Conrardy, C., 685
Constable, 272, 403
Constans, L., 209, 211, 707, 709
Constantin de Magny, C. F., 551
Conti, A., 532
Conti, Giusto de', 236
Convention and invention, 145
Convivial lyric, 4, 15, 35, 151, 169, 176, 187, 201, 214, 225, 347, 357, 359, 375, 376, 422; *see also Carmina Burana*
Conybeare, Mrs., 309
Conybeare, J. J., 738
Cook, A. S., 98, 125, 171, 411, 458, 459, 463–464, 497, 503, 692, 740
Cook, Eliza, 295
Cook, F. C., 774
Cook and Tinker, 740
Cooke, J., 266, 290
Cooper, W. A., 329
Coornhert, D. V., 337
Coplas, 158, 252, 255
Coppée, F., 46, 222, 400
Cordus, Euricius, 415
Corneille, P., 581
Cornish poetry, *see* Appendix; *also* 306–307
Cornish, S. W., 728
Cornwall, Barry (B. W. Procter), 296
Corradino, 239
Corson, H., 300, 747
Cory, H. E., 273, 278, 286, 392, 575, 621, 744, 745
Cosmo, 529
Costa, E., 204, 235, 393
Costa, G., 244
Costa, L., 729
Costa, M., 261
Costanza, Angelo di, 237
Costello, L. S., 217
Cota, R., 252
Couat, A., 154, 180, 464, 614, 681
Coulton, G. G., 728
Counson, A., 718
Coureil, G. de, 95

Court of Love, 207, 210, 728
Court epic, 489, 595, 600, 684, 696, 703–712, 751, 761–763, 777, 781–782
Court lyrics, 185, 199, 206 ff., 228, 250 ff., 262, 271, 276, 277, 279, 313 ff., 360, 387, 392, 402, 407, 410, 710
Court pastoral, 444, 449
Courthope, W. J., 21, **48–49**, 127, 265, 273, 275, 286, 300, 421, 451, **464**, 485, 565, 608, 629, 747
Courtoisie, 206, 209, 210, 228, 250
Coussemaker, E. de, 211
Coverdale, 306
Cowl, R. P., 111
Cowley, A., 113, 277, 279, 405, 417, 433, 439, 559, **562**, 574
Cowleyan ode, 21, 114, 117, 118, 419
Cowper, W., 283, 285, 286, 287, 288, 455, 611, 678
Cox, E. G., 657
Cox, F. A., 273
Cox, Sir G. W., and Jones, E. H., 757, 759
Cox, H. C., 689
Crabb, W. D., 707
Crabbe, 283, 285, 286, 287, 288, 289, 296, 297, 452, 611
Craig, J. A., 363, 782
Craigie, W. A., 339, **767**
Craik, G. L., 273, 744
Cramer, J. A., 324, 408
Cranch, C. P., 687
Crane, 205, 225
Crane, O., 687
Cranmer-Byng, L., 367
Cranstoun, 381
Crashaw, 276
Crawford, J. M., 774
Crawford, Mrs. N. M., 689
Creative imagination, psychology of, 50, 51, 54, 56, 57, 58, 59, 64, 66, 123–124, 126, 135, 144–145, 181, 601, 717–718; *see also* Psychological method in criticism
Creech, T., 452
Creizenach, T., 685
Crépet, E., 205, 219, 707
Crescenzo, V. de, 685
Crescimbeni, G. M., 93, 239, 241, 419, 530
Crescini, V., 206, 704, 723, 724, 727
Crétin, Guillaume, 214
Creutz, G. F., 342
Creuz, F. von, 323, 408
Creuzer, 513
Cristobal de Castillejo, 257, 258
Croce, B., 97, 122, 238, 244, 247, 255, 258, **464**, 527, 550, 572
Croiset, A., 7, **49**, 110, 188, 446, 614, 672
Cronegk, 399
Crow, M. F., 25, 275, 421
Crowest, F. J., 154, 270
Crowley, R., 417
Crudeli, 395
Crueger, J., 757
Cruice, Mgr., 109
Crusades, songs of, 418
Cruse, A., 128, 275
Crusius, O., **154**, 375, 376, 614
Cruttwell, C. T., 381, **683**, **689**
Cueto, L. A. de, 259
Cugnoni, 247
Cuissard, C., 199
Cultural backgrounds, classification, 369–370
Cunliffe, J. W., 273, 291, 300
Cunningham, A., **155**, 280, 284
Cunz, 335
Cust, R. N., 780
Cuvellier-Fleury, A. A., 109
Cybalski, A., 354
Cycles of legends, 428
Cyclic epics, Greek, 516, 650, 651, 664, 679
Cynewulf, 267, 692, 693, 740
Cyprian, 517, 692

Dach, S., 318, 319, 321, 408
Dacier, A., 103, 492, 543
Dacier, Madame, 103, 426 *et passim*, **464–465**, 545, 546, **547**, 548, 549, 552, 553, 567, 579
Dahlgren, K. F., 343
Dahlmann, J., 780
Dahlstjerna, E., 341, 771
Dahn, F., 199
D'Alembert, 105
Dalin, O. von, 341–342, 344, 771

Damasus, 197, 385
Damiani, G. F., 239
Dance and poetry, 142, 160, 164, 177, 180, 185, 189, 205, 372–374, 607, 609, 615, 623, 633, 646, 654, 658
D'Ancona, A., 226, 231, 248, 534
D'Ancona and Bacci, 226, 723
Dandin, 590
Daniel, Arnaut, 208
Daniel, H. A., 194
Daniel, S., 274, 276, 278, 403, 439
Daniello, B., 426, 523, 524
Daniels, W. M., 493
Danish-Norwegian poetry, 345–352, 772–773
D'Annunzio, G., 245, 247
Dante of Majano, 228, 230
Dante, 29, 207, 209, 228–232, 241, 242, 255, 395, 424, 429, 433, 438, 455, 461, 464, 470, 473, 476, 481, 485, 486, 488, 495, 497, 498, 499, 500, 520, 521, 522, 527, 528, 530, 531, 532, 534, 573, 574, 588, 596, 599, 626–627, 636, 644, 691, 699, 702, 712, 713–719 (editions and translations, 716–717), 720, 725, 729, 747
Danzel, T. W., 326, 327
Danzel, Guhrauer, and Boxberger, 328
Daqīqī, 776
Dargan, E. P., 551
Darmesteter, J., 300, 355, 356, 359, 777
Darmesteter and Hatzfeld, 99
Darwin, C., 332, 334
Dasent, Sir G. W., 769
Dass, P., 347
D'Aubignac, Abbé, 492, 524, 532, 533, 540, 546, 548–549, 553, 554, 584, 594, 615, 617, 667, 669, 670,
Daurat, 217
Davenant, Sir W., 433, 439, 466, 478, 559, 561, 562, 569
David the Psalmist, 366
Davidson, J., 290, 295
Davidson, T., 88
Davies, James, 32, 381, 413
Davies, John, 416
Davies, Sir J., 276
Davies, W. H., 291
Davis, H. W. C., 702
Davis, Sir J. F., 367
D'Avril, A., 353, 704
Dawson, W. H., 300
Dawson, W. J., 294
De Amicis, 97
Débat, 161, 163, 207, 209, 210, 229, 268, 269, 451, 611, 612, 630
Décadents, 108, 222, 224, 292, 332
Decius, 319
Decombe, L., 225
Decorum, 523, 539, 543, 545, 546, 547, 556, 558, 562
Dederich, H., 738
De Gubernatis, 97
Dehmel, R., 332, 335
Dejeanne, J. M. L., 208
Delaporte, S. J., 103
Delaporte, V., 543
Delattre, F., 278
Delavigne, J. F. C., 222, 400
Delehaye, H., 689
De Lescure, 223
Delille and Michaud, 687
Del Lungo, I., 204
De Marchi, L., 273, 421
Demetrius Phalereus, 87, 512–513
Democracy, effect of, on poetry, 185, 221, 295
Demogeot, J., 209, 707
Denham, 277, 405
Denina, C., 95
Denis, King of Portugal, 253, 255, 262, 264, 265
Denise, L., *see under* Vial and Denise
Denk, V. M. O., 249
Dennis, J., 25, 49, 286
Dennis, John, 484, 563, 566
Dennis, J. T., 364
Denores, J., 92, 526
Depping, 734
Dequerle, 400
De Quincey, T., 49–50, 121, 286, 300, 573
Derby, Lord, 678
Derned, R. de, 709
De Rossi, 395
Derzhávin, G. R., 353

De Sanctis, F., 97 ff., 234, 244, 246, 247, 534
De Sanctis, N., 237
Desbordes-Valmore, 400
Descartes, R., 540, 547, 548, 550
Deschamps, E., 98, 214
Deschanel, E., 219, 223
Desmarets, J., Sieur de Saint-Sorlin, 492, 493, 538, 542–543, 559–560, 711
Desportes, A., 687
Desportes, P., 218, 398
Desroches, 400
Dessoir, M., 155
Detfurth, von, 320
Deus, J. de, 264
Development, stages of, *see* Types, literary: their growth
Deventer, 188
De Vere, Aubrey T., 294, 296, 300, 574
Devey, J., 300
De Vries, T., 748
Dewey, J., 593
De Witt, N. W., 686
Dhalla, M. N., 359
Diaconus, Paulus, 199
Dialect, poetic, 373
Dick, J. C., 286
Dickens, F. V., 368
Dickinson, W. H., 743
Diction, changes in poetic, 50, 100, 103, 120, 125, 146, 216–217, 221, 228, 235, 238, 239, 257–258, 263, 277, 278, 281, 282, 283, 284, 285, 318, 322 ff., 337, 347, 358, 368, 379, 443
Didactic poetry, 34, 61, 81, 199, 214, 240, 272, 375, 376, 386, 387, 390, 391, 396, 402, 416, 417, 426, 429, 439, 472, 475, 485, 491, 495, 516, 604, 643, 663, 690, 691, 692, 694, 711, 765, 766, 771, 778
Diderot, D., 106, 551, 552
Diehl, 704
Diel, J. B., 333
Dieter, F., 736
Dietmar von Aist, 313
Dietrich von Bern, 760
Dietrich von dem Werder, 577
Dietz, 311
Diez, F., 209, 265
Dilthey, C., 376, 682
Dilthey, W., 50
Dinaux, A., 212
Dindorf and Franke, 678
Dindorf and Maas, 513, 678
Diniz, King, *see* Denis
Dino Frescobaldi, 228, 230
Diogenes Laertius, 508
Dionysius of Halicarnassus, 87, 509, 512, 513, 514
Dionysius Thrax, 43, 87
Dippold, G. T., 621, 752, 757, 759
Dirge, 185, 375, 403, 404, etc. *See* Threnody
Dithyramb, 185 ff.
Dixon, R. W., 294
Dixon, W. M., 266, 280, 290, 300, 423–424, 430, 466, 621, 736, 744, 748
Dobell, 294, 296
Dobson, A., 16, 126, 129, 287, 291, 295, 296, 300, 443
Dobson, S., 210, 728
Dodd, H. P., 32, 415
Doddridge, 283
Dodge, R. E. N., 724
Dods, M., 718
Dodsley, R., 280
Dolce, L., 91, 523
Dolce stil nuovo, 228–231, 233, 234, 395
Domairon, 106
Domitius Marsus, 384, 683
Donadoni, E., 246
Donaldson, J., 689
Donati, L., 724
Donatus, Aelius, 515
Donatus, Tiberius Cl., 515, 687
Doncieux, G., 225, 544
Donne, J., 276, 277, 278, 279, 405
Donner, O., 352
D'Ooge, B. L., 686
Dorat, 220, 399
Dorian lyric, 184 ff., 377, 417–418
Dorigny, G., 398
Dorison, 223
Dorset, 277
Dottin, G., 308, 309
Dottori, 729
Doublet, J., 398

Douglas, Sir G., 287
Doumic, R., 110, 111, 163, 466
Doutrepont, G., 214, 707
D'Ovidio, F., 97, 227, 240, 246, 247, 534, 718–719
Dowden, E., 126, 273, 278, 287, 291, 296, 300, 421, 574
Downer, C. A., 224
Dowson, E., 291
Dozon, A., 775
Dozy, R., 732
Drachmann, H., 350
Dracontius, 386, 694
Dramatic lyric, 33
Drayton, M., 276, 277, 278, 279, 405, 419, 439, 558, 561, 611, 742
Drees, H., 705
Drerup, E., 672–673, 676
Dressel, 518
Dreves, J. M., 194
Drinkwater, J., 50, 291, 295
Driver, S. R., 364, 411
Driver, Plummer, and Briggs, 365
Droege, K., 757
Drummond of Hawthornden, 276, 287, 403, 560
Dryden, J., 113, 277, 278, 279, 287, 405, 417, 419, 426, 431 *et passim*, 454, 466–467, 492, 543, 550, 555, 558, 559, 562, 563, 564, 565, 572, 603, 687, 742
Duault, 400
Du Bartas, G. de S., 346, 536–537, 690, 711, 746, 766
Du Bellay, J., 100–101, 215 ff., 415, 418, 535–536
Dubos, J. B., 504, 545, 546, 550, 552
Ducamin, J., 254
Duchesne, J., 430, 433, 467, 538, 544, 603, 622, 712
Duckett, E. S., 685
Duclos, 354
Düben, von, 352
Dübner, 188
Dümmler, F., 375, 698
Dümmler and Traube, 199, 385
Düntzer, H., 329, 679
Duff, J. W., 156, 381
Dufrénoy, 400
Du Méril, M. E., 156, 203, 385, 389, 699
Dumersan and Ségur, 225
Dumesnil, 712
Dunbar, H., 678
Dunbar, W., 270
Duncker, M., 778
Dunger, H., 709
Dunn, J., 308, 748
Dupont, P., 546
Du Prel, C., 50, 134
Dupuy, E., 223, 636
Durán, 734
D'Urfé, H., 346, 610
Durham, W. H., 114
Dusch, 399
Dutch poetry, 337–338, 765–766
Dwight, T., 748
Dyboski, R., 300
Dyce, A., 280, 563
Dyer, J., 282, 283, 611
Dyer, L., 676

Earle, J., 738
Eastlake, Sir C. L., 287
Ebeling, 678
Eberhard, J. A., 132, 580
Ebert, A., 156, 311, 688 *et passim*
Ebert, J. A., 324
Ebner, 524
Ecbasis Captivi, *see* Beast epic
Eckermann, 132
Eclogue, 100, 161, 200, 237, 384, 385, 391, 396, 404, 446, 452, 500, 614, 649, 657, 697, 700; *see also* Pastoral elegy, Pastoral poetry
Eddas, the, 642, 754, 767–770 (editions and translations, 768–769)
Edmundson, 748
Egger, É., 50–51, 85, 99, 104, 157, 467, 509, 622
Egger, M., 513
Egyptian poetry, 364, 783
Ehrenström, M. d', 240
Eichelkraut, F., 209
Eichendorff, J. von, 331, 333
Eichhoff, F. G., 685, 780
Eichhorn, C., 344
Eicke, T., 705
Εἰδύλλια, 446, 447, 612
Eilhart von Oberge, 313, 751
Eimer, M., 300
Einarsson, H., 767

Einhard, 698
Einstein, L., 273, 421, 721
Ekkehard, 201, 691, 700, 750
Elderkin, G. W., 681
Eleanor of Poitiers, 211
Elegy, 4, 25–30, 100, 101, 105, 109, 112, 116, 125, 154, 161, 163, 165, 172, 177, 182, 184, 186, 190, 195, 196, 199, 200, 203, 204, 216, 220, 243, 267, 271, 276, 279, 281–282, 295, 341, 343, 348, 357, 366, 372, **374–412**, 414, 416, 418, 446, 449–450, 475, 495, 514, 575, 613, 660, 663, 697; *see also* Pastoral elegy, Dirge, Threnody, Complaints, *Lamenti*, *Planctus*, *Plainte*, *Klagelied*, Penitential lyric, Erotic lyric, etc.
Eliot, G., 33, 287
Ellinger, G., 203, 320
Elliot, Ebenezer, 295
Elliot, F., 622
Elliot, Jane, 284
Ellis, E. J., 287
Ellis, G., 268
Ellis, R., 191, 203, 296, 381
Elton, O., 128, 279, 287, 574
Elze, K., 135, 300, 436, 604
Emerson, R. W., 127, 356
Emotions, aesthetic, 36–39
Empedocles, 516, 563
Encyclopédie, 70, 106, 220, 492, 551, 552
Enfances de Rodrigue, 733
Engel, C., 374
Engel, J. J., 51, 132, 580
Engelbrechtsdatter, D., 347
English poetry, 265–306, 401–406, 416–417, 419–420, 736–748
Ennius, 382, 414, 514, 683, 684, 685
Ennodius, 386
Eobanus Hessus, 576, 669
Ephraem Syrus, 192
Epic, classification of, 436–437, 439 ff., 459, 463, 474, 482–483, 496, 500, 505, 525, 602–603, 658–659, 662, 664
Epic, definitions of, **423–431**, 456, 458, 465, 466, 475, 479, 484, 501, 504, 507, 518, 523, 525, 535, 536, 538, 546, 556, 557, 562, 563, 576, 662
Epic, function of, 427–428, 437–438, 457, 463, 465, 472, 476, 494, 534, 552, 567, 580, 586, 659, 716
Epic, natural versus artificial, 425, 427, 428–429, 430, 431, 453, 457, 459–460, 474–475, 476, 478, 488, 497, 505, 571, **593–596**, 602, 619, 622, 625, 646, 662, 664, 666–667, 721, 778–782
Epic, origin of, **591–599**, 619, 621, 631–632, 636, 640, 643, 649, 652, 655, 656, 658, 660, 662, 665
Epic, painting, and sculpture, interrelation of, 474–475
Epic, philosophical, *see* Didactic poetry, *also* 475
Epic, philosophical criticism of, 427–428, 432, 462, 475–476, 495, 506–507, **508–511**, 516, 517, 521, 580–581, **582–584**, 586–587, 662–663
Epic, stages of development, 428, 594–595, 599, 630, 631–632, 640, 642, 645, 646, 647–648, 649, 650, 658–659, 664, 675
Epic, the term a critical convention, 464
Epic, theory and history of, 423–783 (for details see Table of Contents)
Epic of the bourgeoisie, 476
Epic as expression of national spirit, 427–428, 431–432, 437, 460, 462, 464, 472, 475, 489, 497, 498, 506, 507, 531, 571, 586, 663, 716, 746
Epic and other types of literature, interrelation of, 603–605; epic and drama, 424, 425, 427, 433–436, 437, 439, 454, 456, 460–461, 463, 466–467, 468, 470, 471, 474, 477, 478, 479, 482, 483, 485, 486, 487, 495, 496, 501, 502, 505, 509, 522, 524, 525, 551, 552, 559, 560, 561, 566, 570, 583, 589, 650; epic and elegy, 26, 376, 418, 475; epic and history, 425, 427, 429, 431–432, 434, 437–438, 456, 460, 466, 467, 477, 479, 482, 483, 489, 496, 501, 507, 523, 524, 525, 542,

560, 561, 570, 576, 586, 598–599, 619, 634, 642, 644, 648, 655, 656, 663, 731, 739, 741, 746, 755–756, 767, 776; epic and idyl, 447–448, 457, 603–604, 611–612, 615; epic and lyric, 436, 437, 439, 457, 472, 474, 476, 489, 493, 496, 502, 596, 619, 638, 658, 663, 665, 706–707; epic and novel, 439, 473, 486, 487, 498, 539, 540, 541, 542, 544, 570, 574, 583, 603–604; epic and ode, 418; epic and romance, 425, 426, 434, 435, 436, 439, 456, 460, 463, 465, 481, 482, 485, 486, 501, 603–604, 639, 658, 663, 709–711, 761

Epic episodes, 435, 500, 599

Epic poets, references: Alexandrian, 511, 614; Babylonian-Sumerian, 782–783; Bohemian (Cheskian), 775; Bulgarian, 604; Byzantine, 682; Celtic, 604, 748–749; Croatian, 604; Danish-Norwegian, 772–773; Dark and Middle Ages, 520–521, 688–702, 740–741; Dutch, 576, 589, 765–766; English, 555–575, 610–611, 614, 736–748; Finnish, 621, 773–774; French, 535–555, 611, 614, 703–712; German, 575–589, 611, 614, 749–765; Greek, 4, 508–513, 610, 614, 668–682; Greek-Christian, 519; Icelandic, 767–770; Indian (Sanskrit), 590, 778–782; Italian, 520–535, 610, 712–729; Latin-Christian, 516–518, 688–702; Lithuanian, 595; Lower races, 783; Magyar (Hungarian), 775; Norse, 767–770; Persian, 776–778; Polish, 774–775; Portuguese, 734–736, 783; Roman, 513–516, 610, 614, 682–688; Russian, 595, 604, 655, 774–775; Scandinavian, 595; Serbian, 595, 604, 657, 775; Slavic, 646, 774–775; Spanish, 595, 729–734; Swedish, 770–772; Tartar, 604

Epictetus, 509, 513

Epicurus, 509

Epigram, 30–32, 100, 101, 112, 116, 163, 171, 173, 179, 190, 197, 199, 200, 201, 204, 216, 263, 271, 320, 329, 357, 372, 379, 381, 382, 384, 385, 386, 387, 390, 404, 412–417, 472, 475

Epinicion, 187

Episseries, 100 ff., 215

Epitaph, 198, 199, 377, 382, 386, 387, 403–404, 414

Epithalamia, 153, 187, 195, 198, 341, 347, 353, 372, 385, 403, 448

Epithets, epic, *see* Formulae, epic

Epopée vs. epic poem, 622

Epyllia, 683, 765

Equicola, M., 91

Erasmus, D., 576

Eratosthenes, 379

Ercilla y Zúñiga, A. de, 734

Ercole, P., 230

Erhardt, L., 673

Erigena, 388

Erk, L., and Böhme, F. M., 311, 336

Erlach, K. von, 336

Erman, A., 364

Ermanarich saga, 760

Ermatinger, E., 188

Ermini, 727

Ermoldus Nigellus, 387, 388, 691, 698

Ernst, G., 406

Ernst, O., and A. W., 332

Erotic lyric, *see* Elegy, *Dolce stil nuovo*, Troubadours, Petrarch, *Minnesang*, Persian poetry, Indian poetry, Egyptian poetry, Lower races, Epigram

Ersch and Gruber, 345

Erskine, J., 12, 52, 157, 266, 267, 270 *et passim*

Escalante y Prieto, A. de (Juan García), 260

Eschenberg, J. J., 132

Eskuche, G., 614

Espinel, V., 410

Espinosa, A. M., 732

Espringerie, 16

Espronceda, 260

Estampidas, 392

Estève, E., 300

Esther, Book of, 447, 613

Estienne, H., 218

Ethé, H., 356, 357, 360, 361, 777
Ettmüller, L., 314, 737
Eugenius II, 198, 386
Euhemerism, 438, 597, 648
Euling, K., 417
Eulogy, *see* Panegyric
Euphorion of Chalcis, 379
Euphuism, 257, 258, 408
Euripides, 186
Eustathius, 453, 678
Evans, Sir A. J., 676
Evans, E., 117, 308, 748
Evans, S., 742, 744
Everett, C. C., 127
Everett, W., 724
Evers, F., 332
Ewald, 365
Ewald, J., 346, 348, 351–352
Ewald (Friedländer), O., 334
Ewing, J. C., 286
'Expressiveness,' 122, 425, 463, 464, 545, 550, 572
Ezekiel, 411

Fable, 439, 460, 466, 472, 477, 482, 500, 578, 623–624, 637, 638, 663, 701
Fabri, P., 99
Fabriano, G. A. G. da, 92
Fabricius, G., 418, 515, 576
Fabricius, J. A., 669
Fabris, G., 236
Fagiuoli, G. B., 243
Faguet, É., 99, 103, 108, 110, 219, 554
Fairbanks, A., 513
Fairclough, H. R., 622, 685
Fairfax, 277
Fairy-tale and epic, 460, 472, 488–489, 500, 597, 624, 627, 635, 652, 662, 663, 680, 783
Falcão, C., 263
Falke, G., 332
Fallersleben, A. H. Hoffmann von, 331, 335, 337
Fantozzi, A., 236
Faraday, L. W., 749, 769
Faral, E., 209, 393, 707, 709
Farinelli, A., 718
Farley, F. E., 287
Farnell, G. S., 157, 183
Farnell, I., 208
Farnell, L. R., 676
Fashion, psychology of, 257–258, 277
Fate in the epic, 432–433, 437, 470, 472, 476, 477, 495, 497, 505, 506, 507, 586, 642
Fathers of the Church, 88, 516–519
Fauriel, C., 188, 209, 610, 635, 707
Fawkes, F., 569, 681, 682
Fay, E. A., 713
Fazio degli Uberti, 233, 234, 720
Fécamp, A., 648, 759, 760
Federn, K., 718
Fehr, 505
Fehse, H., 273, 421
Feigel, T., 329
Feillet, A., 542
Feist, A., 231
Feitama, S., 766
Feith, R., 338, 766
Fellman, J., 352
Feminization of poetry, 379, 391, 393, 404, 407, 449, 680
Fénelon, F. de S. de La Mothe, 436, 458, 492, 547, 549, 569, 570, 622, 712
Fennell, 21
Ferguson, R., 284
Ferguson, Sir Samuel, 294
Fernández de Constantia, J., 251
Fernández de Moratín, L., 260
Fernández y González, F., 136, 255
Fernando de Herrera, 257, 410
Ferrai, L., 237
Ferrari, D., 247
Ferrari, G., 722
Ferrari, S., 237, 239, 245, 247, 248
Ferrario, G., 613, 723
Ferraro, G., 248
Ferrazi, G. J., 233, 713, 723, 727
Ferreira, A., 263, 410
Ferrer, F., 253
Ferrini, O., 238
Festa, G. B., 226
Feutry, 399
Fiammazzo, A., 713
Fichte, J. G., 133, 330
Fick, A., 673
Fiedler, H. G., 310

Fielding, H., 567, 742
Filelfo, F., 720
Filicaia, 239, 396
Finck, 355
Findeis, R., 309
Finnish poetry, 352, 773–774
Finnsburg fragment, 736, 739, 750
Finsler, G., 467–468, 520, 555, 575, 581, 588, 668, 712 *et passim*
Finzi, G., 233, 246
Fiorentino, F., 237
Fiorentino, Giovanni, 233
Fioretti, B., 92, 529
Firdawsī, 360, 361, 499, 776–777
Firenzuola, A., 395
Fischer, Alb., 320
Fischer, A., and Tümpel, W., 336
Fischer, Aug. W., 334
Fischer, Heinrich, 756
Fischer, Hermann, 321, 753, 757
Fischer, J. G., 332
Fischer, R., 436 *et passim*, 468–469, 588, 757
Fisher, L. A., 622
Fishermen, eclogues and idyls of, 612, 613, 649
Fiske, A. K., 622
Fiske, W., 233
Fitzgerald-Edward, 295, 297, 358
Fitzmaurice-Kelly, J., 248, 249, 729, 731, 734
Flach, H., 157, 183, 375, 412
Flamini, F., 90, 95, 97, 218, 226, 229, 230, 234, 235, 236, 237, 243, 258, 714, 718, 724, 725, 727, 729
Flaminio, M. A., 418
Flavius Cresc. Corippus, 695
Flavus, Alfius, 384
Flecker, J. E., 291
Fleming, P., 318, 319, 321, 408
Fletcher, Giles and Phineas, 276, 278
Fletcher, J., 404, 610
Fletcher, J. B., 99, 218, 273, 275
Fletcher, R. H., 743
Fleury, J., 225
Flint, R., 532, 661, 662
Flodoard, 691, 701
Floeck, O., 157
Florenz, K., 368
Florus of Lyons, 200, 388
Flügel, E., 274, 560, 609
Förstemann, A., 685
Förster, G., 336
Foerster, W., 213
Foffano, F., 92, 712, 721, 723
Fogazzaro, 245
Folengo, T., 724
Folgore da San Gimignano, 228
Folk ballad, 441–442, 485, 505, 605 ff.
Folk composition, *see Lieder-Theorie*, Communal authorship, Folk epic
Folk epic, 423, 425, 428, 429, 433, 438, 459, 460, 472, 480, 483, 486, 488–489, 531, 540, 548–549, 553, 582, 593–596, 600–602, 604, 616, 618, 619, 625, 630, 631–632, 633–634, 636, 640, 642, 646, 650, 652, 657, 658–659, 665, 680, 681, 716, 767, 774–775, 778, 783
Folk lyric, and popular poetry, 4, 15, 16, 40, 45, 47, 58–59, 111, 135, 142, 150, 151, 154, 158, 160, 165, 167, 168, 169, 171, 178, 181, 184, 186, 187, 188, 189, 193, 203, 206, 213, 219, 221, 224–225, 226–227, 229, 231, 232, 234, 235, 236, 247–248, 252, 260, 263, 265, 269, 270, 273, 274, 310, 311, 316, 318, 319–320, 325, 328, 331, 332, 333, 336, 337, 339, 340, 341, 342, 343, 344, 345, 346, 352, 355, 356, 360, 363, 364, 366, 368, 369–374, 385, 388, 390, 392, 395, 398, 402, 407, 417, 421, 462, 483, 485, 582, 596, 605, 607, 609–610, 612, 618, 619, 625, 633–634, 647, 658, 663, 679. *See further under* Folk epic
Folk tales, 597–599, 664
Folklore, 598, 608, 624, 644, 783
Follen, 331
Folquet de Lunel, 209
Folquet de Marseille, 210
Folquet de Romans, 208
Fonseca, 262
Fontaine, C., 398
Fontanella, G., 395
Fontanelle, B. de, 103, 219, 452, 492, 543–544, 546
Fontanes, L. de, 221, 400

Forbes, Sir W., 287
Ford, J. D. M., and Mary A., 723
Forke, A., 367
Formal criticism, of the lyric, 4–5, 111 and § 3, *passim*; of the epic, 425–427, 516, 522–529, 532, 533, 535–545, 546, 547, 550, 551, 554, 555–570, 576–581, 590, 671
Formal differentiation of poetic kinds, 516
Forman, H. B., 300, 497
Formont, M., 265
Formulae, epic, 431, 442, 488–489, 490, 505, 579, 605, 652, 738, 758
Fornaciari, R., 234, 247
Forsman, A. V., 774
Forster, J., 287, 300
Forsythe, R. S., 443
Fort, P., 224
Forteguerri (Carteromaco), 241
Forteguerri, N., 729
Fortmüller, K., 479, 577
Fortunatus, Venantius, 193, 198, 386, 387, 388, 691, 695, 696
Foscolo, Ugo, 233, 243, 244, 246, 395, 397, 534, 718
Foulché-Delbosc, R., 254, 255
Foulet, L., 204, 593, 597, 623–624, 638, 701, 711, 763, 783
Foulke, W. D., 234
Fourmont, É., 492, 548
Fournel, V., 469
Foxwell, A. K., 274, 421
Fränkel, L., 274
France, A., 110, 223
Franciscan poetry, 228–229, 231
Francius (Fransz), P., 492
Francke, K., 625, 759
Francken, C. M., 687
Franke, 780
Frankl, L. A., 775
Franzén, F. M., 343, 771
Franzos, K. E., 335
Frati, L., 236
Fraticelli, 232
"Frauenlob," *see* Heinrich von Meissen
Frazer, Sir J. G., 371, 373, 438, 593, 598, 649
"Free verse," 296
Freidank, 314
Freiligrath, F., 331, 334
French poetry, 16, 204–225, 392–393, 397–401, 416, 419, 703–712
Frere, Hookham, 295
Frescobaldi, Dino, 228, 230
Frescobaldi, Matteo, 233
Frese, J., 341
Freybe, A., 437, 469
Freymond, E., 708
Frezzi, F., 720
Frick and Polack, 469, 625, 752, 762, 764
Friedländer, 673
Friedlaender, M., 322
Friedmann, K., 469
Friedmann, S., 229
Friedreich, J. B., 171
Friedrich von Hausen, 314
Friesen, Freiherr von, 333
Frigeri, L., 712, 729
Friis, J. A., 352
Frimann, 348, 772
Fritsche, E. G. O., 335
Fritze, 363
Fritzsche, C., 699
Fröberg, T., 158
Fröding, G., 344
Froissart, 466
Frothingham, O. B., 300
Frottole, 16
Froude, J. A., 573
Frugoni, 241, 243, 395
Frye, 738
Fulgentius, 518, 520, 521, 685, 691, 696
Fuller, E., 300
Fuller, H. de W., 52
Fulvius Ursinus, 523
Furnivall, F. J., 300
Fusco, A., 525

Gacon, F., 492, 548
Gadsby, J., 306
Gaelic revival, 294
Gaisford, 187
Gajsek, S. von, 747
Gale, Norman, 295
Galeotto, F., 395
Galiano, A. M. A., 258
Galician poetry, *see* Spanish poetry
Galli, V., 93

Gallus, 379, 382
Galton, A., 300
Gandar, E., 217
García, F. B., 260
García, J., 260
García, V., 261
Garcilaso de la Vega, 256, 257, 258, 410
Gardner, E. G., 230, 714, 718, 725
Gardner, M. M., 775
Gardner, P., 188, 677
Garnett, J. M., 740
Garnett, L. M. J., 188, 610
Garnett, R., 234, 279, 301, 413, 574, 712, 718, 724, 727, 747
Garrett, A., 262, 264
Gartelmann, H., 434, 435, 470
Garth, 562
Gascoigne, G., 112, 272, 273, 275, 403
Gaskoin, C. J. B., 697
Gaspary, A., 229, 712
Gasté, A., 213
Gaster, B., 330
Gaster, M., 709
Gates, L. E., 128, 301
Gāthās, 357–358, 360, 361
Gato, J. Á., 252
Gattinger, E., 270
Gaudin, P., 110
Gaussen, A. C. C., 287
Gautier de Chatillon, 775
Gautier d'Espinaus, 211
Gautier, L., 158, 594–595, 597, 600, 625, 646, 703, 705, 708, 728
Gautier, T., 46, 110, 221, 222, 223, 287, 301, 400
Gay, J., 282, 285, 287, 405, 611
Gay, L. M., 101
Gay Saber, 253
Gayley, C. M., 7, 16, 24, 28, 53, 115, 122, 123, 129, 141, 187, 424, 429, 430 *et passim*, 447, 448, 449, 470, 491, 625–626, 699, 753, 769
Gayley, C. M., and Scott, F. N., 41, 53–54, 90, 139–141, 470, 507 *et passim*
Gebhart, E., 713
Geddes, J., 703, 705, 706
Geddes, Sir W. D., 628, 643, 673
Gehring, 678
Geibel, E., 11, 331, 332, 334, 409
Geiger, A., 365
Geiger, E., 8, 54, 134
Geiger, L., 317, 702
Geiger and Kuhn, 356, 776
Geijer, E. G., 343, 345
Geijer and Afzelius, 340
Geike, S. A., 685
Geldner, K. F., 356, 360, 778
Gellert, C. F., 133, 324, 327, 580
Gellius, A., 87, 515, 523
Gelzer, H., 764
Genealogical poem, 654
Genelin, P., 761
Genest, C. C., 452
Genestet, P. A. de, 338
Génin, F., 705
Genius, essays on nature of, 601
Gennep, A. van, 673
Gentil-Bernard, 399
Genung, C. H., 577
Geoffrey of Monmouth, 742, 744
Georges, H., 515, 685
Georgic, 485, 643, 649
Géraud, E., 400
Gerber, 624
Gercke, A., 685
Gerhardt, P., 319
Gering, H., 739
German poetry, 309–336, 406–409, 417, 749–765
Gerould, G. H., 626, 689, 701, 740
Gerstenberg, H. W. von, 581
Gervinus, G. G., 317, 626
Gessner, S., 399, 618
Gests, 428, 439, 470, 474, 599, 620, 629, 631
Ghazal, 179, 333, 357, 359
Giacomino da Verona, 228
Giacomo da Lentino (or Lentini), 230
Gianni, Lapo, 228
Giannini, G., 248
Giannone, 244
Giarratani, C., 188
Gibb, E. J. W., 355
Gibb, J., 739, 759
Gibbon, E., 497, 512, 569, 685
Gibson, W. W., 291, 295
Gide, A., 224
Gidel, C. A., 209

Giesebrecht, G., 702
Gifford, 120
Gifford, W., 303
Gilbert, N. J. L., 399
Gilbert, W. S., 295
Gilchrist, A., 287
Gildersleeve, B. L., 21, 25, 452
Gildon, C., 116, 562, 566
Giles, H. A., 367
Giles, J. A., 744
Gilfillan, G., 287
Gilgamesh epic, 638, 718, 782–783
Gili, Andre, 523
Gillet, J. E., 575, 765
Gillett, C. R., 519, 688
Giner, F., 54, 470
Gingerich, S. F., 301
Ginguené, P. L., 238, 400
Giovagnoli, R., 246
Giovanna, I. della, 247
Giovanni, D., 712
Giovio, 204
Girard, J., 188, 626
Giuggiola, 235
Giuliani, G. B., 232
Giuriani, R., 223
Giusti, 244
Givler, R. C., 124
Gjerset, K., 287
Gladstone, W. E., 432 *et passim*, 470, 472, 673, 677
Gladwin, F., 361
Gleditsch, H., 54
Gleim, J. W. L., 323, 324, 327, 331, 408, 409, 417
Glöde, 740
Glover, R., 439, 567
Glover, T. R., 470–471
Gnoli, D., 237, 245
Gnomic poetry, 377, 380, 475
Godeau, A., 104, 433, 541
Godescalc, 200
Göckingk, L. F. G. von, 325, 327
Goedeke, K., 309–310, 319, 321, 327, 329, 588, 753 *et passim*
Goedeke and Tittmann, J., 317, 321, 336
Goeje, M. J., 356
Görbing, F., 626
Görres, J., 331, 777
Goes, J. A. van der, 766
Göthe, G., 344
Goethe, J. W. von, 131–132, 138, 301, 325, 326, 327, 328, 330, 331, 349, 358, 409, 414, 417, 427, 439, 452, 471, 474, 475, 479, 483, 496, 498, 580, 581, 582–583, 585, 599, 625, 675, 747, 765
Goldsmith, O., 117, 282, 283, 285, 286, 287, 417, 611
Goliardic poems, *see Carmina Burana*
Gollancz, I., 740
Gollnisch, 380, 381
Golther (*for* Schröder, E.), 705
Golther, W., 312, 762
Góngora, 257–258, 259, 263
Gontier de Soignies, 211
Gonzáles, D., 260
Gonzalo de Berceo, 251, 255
Gonzalve de Magalhães, 783
Googe, 271
Gori, P., 246
Gorra, E., 209, 227, 651, 703, 709
Gorsse, 400
Gosche, R., 612, 614
Gossart, J. B., 105
Gosse, E. W., 5, 16, 20, 21, 34, 55, 126, 129, 279, 287, 290, 291, 294, 295, 296, 301, 316, 337, 339, 340, 345, 352, 445, 447, 472, 626, 766, 769
Gostwick, J., 757
Gothic revival, 283, 287, 343, 345, 771
Gotter, F. W., 408, 409
Gottfried von Strassburg, 313, 751, 761, 762
Gottschalk, 200
Gottschall, R., 55, 138, 331, 440, 472
Gottsched, J. C., 130–131, 323–324, 326, 408, 460, 577–578, 579, 580, 763
Gould, G., 55–56
Goulston, T., 559, 561
Gourmont, R. de, 224
Gover, C. E., 363
Gower, 270
Gozzi, G., 242, 243, 532
Graefe, 681
Graetz, 365

Graevell, P., 705
Graf, A., 97, 238, 240, 243, 245, 246, 397, 534, 709, 712
Gragg, F. A., 413
Gramont, F. de, 16, 167
"Grand style," the, 455, 456, 719
Grandgent, C. H., 229, 230, 518, 520, 626–627, 699, 713–714, 718
Grandi, 728
Grantgow, H., 327
Grasberger, H., 145, **158**
Grassmann, H., 362
Graves, A. P., 308
Graves, R., 32
Gravina, G., 94, 239, **472**, **531**, 532
Gray, C. D., 363
Gray, T., 34, **56**, 116, 246, 282, 283, 285, 286, 287, 288, 289, 397, 400, 419, 568, 611
Graziani, 728
Graziolo de' Bambagiuoli, 233
Grazzini, C., 528
Grécourt, 220
Greek poetry, 4–5, 15, 26, 30, 183–189, 375–381, 412–415, 418, 668–682
Green, J. R., 431 *et passim*, 472, 497, 684
Green, M., 611
Greene, G. A., 244
Greg, W. W., **158**, 274, **443–445**, 472, 609, 611, 627
Gregory the Great, 193, 691, 699
Gregory Nazianzen, 192
Gregory, Lady I. A., 749
Greif, W., 709
Grein, C. W. M., 737, 739
Grein, C. W. M., and Wülker, R. P., 267
Gresset, 220
Grierson, J. C., 279
Griesmann, 760
Griffin, Gerald, 296
Griffith, F. L., 783
Griffith, R. T. H., 362, 782
Grilli, L., 203
Grimald, 271, 272
Grimm, H., 329
Grimm, J., **316**, 623, 624, 637, 752, 769, 774
Grimm, W., 333, 706, 752, 760
Grimm and Schmeller, 203
Grisebach, E., 328, 332, 334
Griswold, 298
Grisy, A. de, 223
Gröber, G., **158–159**, 202, 212, 588, 627, 688, 702, 729 *et passim*
Gronovius, A., 669
Groos, K., 36, 373
Groos, K., and Netto, I., **56**
Grosart, A. B., 472, 610, 626, 744
Groser, H. G., 296
Grosse, E., 159, 370, 593, **627**
Grosse, J., 332, 335
Grossi, 244
Grossmann, H., 561
Grossmann, K., 310
Grote, G., 473, 594, **627–628**, 643, 672, 673, 679, 758
Grotius, H., 203, 746
Grucker, É., 129
Grüber, J. G., 328
"Grün, A." (Auersperg, A. A. von), 331, 409
Gruener, G., 758
Gruffydd ab yr Yuad Côch, 402
Grundtvig, S., 345, 349, 350, 352, 773
Grundtvig and Sigurdsson, 340
Gruppe, O. F., 160, 381
Gryphius, A., 318, 319, 321, 408, 417, 419
Guarini, G. B., 237, 319, 449, 450, 610
Guasti, C., 501
Gubernatis, A. de, 160, 354, 355, 628
Gudrun, 625, 648, 751, 754, 758, 759–760
Günther, C. A. W., 752, 762
Günther, J. C., 322, 408
Guerber, H. A., 491
Guerrini, 245
Gürtler and Hoffmann, 685
Guerzoni, G., 240
Guessard, F., 98
Guest, Lady Charlotte, 744, 749
Guest, E., 56
Guggenheim, J., 274, 421
Gui de Couci, 211
Guiccioli, Countess, 301
Guidi di Pavia, 239

Guidi, U., 727
Guidiccioni, Giov., 237, 396
Guido delle Colonne, 228
Guilhade, D. J. G. de, 265
Guillaume IX, Comte de Poitiers, 208, 210
Guillem de Bergadan, 253
Guillem de Cervera, 253
Guillon, C., 225
Guinizelli, Guido, 228, 230, 231
Guirault de Bornelh, 208
Guittone d' Arezzo, 228, 230
Guittone, Fra, 230
Gummere, F. B., 34, **56–57**, 128, 145, 160, 161, 267, 311, 431 *et passim*, **473**, 592, 593, 597, 599 *et passim*, 619, **628–629**, 632, 633, 738, 739
Gunkel, H., 364, 599, **629–630**, 782
Gurney, E., **57**
Gurteen, S. H., **473**, 747
Gutierre de Cetina, 257, 258
Guy, H., 215, 218
Gwalchmai, 402
Gyllenborg, G. F., 771
Gyraldus, L. G., 203

Haag, H., 135
Haakh, E., 315
Habington, 276
Hadlaub, Johann, 314
Haeberlin, C., 614
Haeckel, E., 332
Haessner, M., 202, 270
Häuschkel, B., 739
Hafiz, 357, 358, 360, 412
Hagedorn, F. von, 322–323, 324, 326, 329, 417
Hagen, F. H. von der, 312, 319, 709, 758
Hagen, P., 762
Hahn, W., 753, 755
Haigh, D. H., 739
Hajw, 357
Haldane and Kemp, 496
Hales, J. W., and Furnivall, F. J., 287
Hall, H. M., 613, 614
Hall, H. R., 677
Hall, J., 112, 557
Hall, J. L., 740
Hallam, A. H., 301
Hallam, H., 433, 436, **473**, 630, 727
Haller, A. von, 322–323, 326, 408, 409
Halm, 514
Hamann, J. G., **581–582**, 584, 617
Hamel, A., 764
Hamel, R., 327, 469
Hamelius, P., 113, 563
Hamilton, C., 434, 439, **473**
Hamilton, Walter, 301
Hammarsköld, L., 340, 771
Hammerich, 351
Hammer-Purgstall, J. von, 331, 354, 355, 360
Hammond, James, 400, 405
Hancock, A. E., 301
Haney, J. L., 301
Hanford, J. H., 161, 279, 391, 630
Hanke, 353
Hannay, D., 256, 257
Hanscom, E. D., 267, 739
Hanselli, P., 340, 344
Hansen, A., 565
Hansen, Th., 321
Hanssen, F., 729
Hapgood, I. F., 353, 596, 600, 630, 774, 775
Hardenberg, F. von, *see* "Novalis"
Hardie, W. R., **473**
Hardiman, J., 307, 308
Harding, V. E., 262
Hardouin, Père J., 492, 545, 549
Hardy, T., 291
Hardy, W. R., 86
Haren, W. van, 338, 766
Harington, Sir J., 416, 426, 556, 557
Harlez, C. de, 360
Harnack, A., 688, 689
Harnack, O., 135, 431, **474**, 588
Harris, J. C., 623
Harris, W. T., 718
Harrison, F., 301
Harrison, J. E., 677
Harrison, J. S., 274, 279
Harsdörffer, G., 318, 319, 321
Hart, H., 765
Hart, Julius and Heinrich, 332, 335
Hart, W. M., 442, **474**, 594, 598, 599, 608, 609, 620, 631–632, 633, 640, 705

Hartland, S., 371, 373
Hartleben, O. E., 332
Hartmann von Aue, 313, 315, 468, 751, 761, 762
Hartmann, A., 336
Hartmann, E. von, **57**, 138, 450, 474–475, 587
Hartmann, M., 356
Hartung, J. A., **161**, 378, **475**, 588
Harvey, G., 112
Hasell, E. J., 727
Haskin, C. E., 687
Hassek, O. de, 229
Hastie, W., 58
Hastings, 365
Haube, O., 683, 687
Hauch, J. C., 350
Haug, J. C. F., 417
Haug, M., 360
Haupt, E., 315
Haupt, J., 760
Haupt, M., 161, 381, 384
Haupt, M., and Vahlen, J., 381
Hausen, F. von, 207
Hauvette (Hauvette-Besnault), A., 188, 189
Hauvette, H., 712, 714
Havens, R. D., 562
Hawker, R. S., 742
Hawkesworth, J., 570
Hayes, Alfred, 295
Hayley, W., 287, 734
Haym, R., 328, **333**, 633
Hazard, P., 246
Hazlitt, W., 120, 125, 274, 287, 301, 573
Hazlitt, W. C., 274
Hearn, L., 368
Hebbel, F., **57**, 144, 332, 334, 415, 417
Heber, R., 296, 742
Hebrew poetry, ancient, 58, 364–366, 411–412
Hecht, H., 608
Hedborn, 343
Hedge, F. H., 754
Heelu, Jan van, 765
Heermann, J., 319
Hegel, G. W. F., 5, 6, **57–58**, 61–62, 122, 133, 134, 138, 139, 145, 161–162, 350, 427 *et passim*, 449, **475–476**, 503, 505, 586–587, 593, 600 *et passim*, **632**
Heiberg, A. C. L., 351
Heiberg, J. L., 350, 352
Heide, A. von der, 279
Heidenstam, V. von, 344
Heider, O., 270
Heiligen Georg, Lied vom, 750
Heilmann, H., 367
Heine, H., 287, 301, 331, 333, 334, 409
Heinemann, K., 328
Heinrich, Der arme, 625
Heinrich von Meissen ("Frauenlob"), 314, 315
Heinrich von Morungen, 314, 315
Heinrich von Veldeke, 313, 314, 751, 761, 762
Heinrich, J. B., 333
Heinrich, O., 760
Heinse, W., 409
Heinsius, D., 558, 561, 576, 681
Heinze, P., and Goette, R., 135
Heinze, R., 476, 588, 681
Heinzel, R., 311, 739
Heiric, 691, 697
Heitland, W. E., 687
Helbig, W., 642, 677
Heldenbuch, 751, 752, 760
Helfferich, A., 255
Heliand, 625, 750
Hellanicus, 669
Hellems, F. B. R., 413
Helm, H., 274
Helm, R., 518, 685
Helmers, J. F., 766
Helmholtz, A. A., 301
Hénault, J., 399
Henckell, K., 332, 335
Henderson, T. F., 274, 279, 287, **476**, 593, 599, 604 *et passim*, 629, 632–633, 647
Henley, W. E., 31, 127, 128, 266, 287, 291, 296, 301
Hennequin, 108, 141
Henning, R., 756
Henninger, E., 708
Henrici, E., 315
Henry VIII, 273
Henry, J., 385–386
Henry, V., 362, 780, 781

Henryson, 268
Hensel, H., 209
Hentze, C. (Dindorf and Hentze), 678
Hepple, N., 58, 145–146, 266, 476
Heraclitus, 508
Herbert, G., 276, 278, 279
Herculano, 264
Herdegen, J., 321
Herder, J. G. von, 32, 58–59, 132, 325–326, 328, 330, 348, 365, 417, 431 *et passim*, 476–477, 549, 580, 581, 582, 584, 585, 587, 602, 603, 617, 633–635, 670
Heredia, J. M. de, 46, 222
Herford, C. H., 162, 301, 306, 321, 635
Héricault, C. de, 214, 600, 635, 708
Herluison and Kerviler, 541
Hermann, G., 594, 635, 665, 673
Hermanni, N., 340
Hermesianax, 379
Hernando de Acuña, 257, 410
Hernando del Castillo, 251, 253
Heroic ideal, 432, 434–435, 457, 460–461, 462, 482, 484, 488, 490, 501, 507, 531, 562, 575, 580, 654, 661, 691, 754
Heron, A., 213
Herrick, R., 276, 278, 279, 289, 417
Hertel, 780
Hertz, H., 350
Hertz, W., 762
Hertzberg, W., 274, 421
Hervey, J., 397, 399, 405
Herwegh, G., 331, 409
Hesiod, 500, 508, 510, 516, 679, 746
Hesse, 330
Hessler, L. B., 413
Hessus, Eobanus, 576, 669
Hettinger, F., 718
Hettner, H. J. T., 322, 327, 333
Heuser, O., 301
Heusler, A., 598, 599, 608, 609, 636, 640, 646, 739, 752
Hewlett, H. G., 126
Heydenreich, K. H., 132
Heyne, C. G., 549, 584, 594, 667, 670, 678, 686
Heyne, M., 311
Heyse, P., 332, 334
Heywood, J., 416
Hibernicus Exul, 691, 696
Hierotheus, 192
Higginson, T. W., 150
Hilarius of Arles, 690, 694
Hilary of Poitiers, 518, 521
Hild, J. A., 686
Hildebrand, Lay of, 660, 736, 739, 750
Hilferding, A. F., 774
Hill, G. B., 287
Hillard, G. S., 477
Hillebrand, J., 477, 588
Hiller, 381
Hillscher, 413
Himes, J. A., 574
Hinneberg, P., 162, 477, 588 *et passim*
Hinojosa, E. de, 730
Hinrichs, H. F. W., 329
Hipponax, 184
Hirn, Y., 36, 478, 593, 636
Hirt, H., 162
Hirtzel, F. A., 686
Hirtzel, L., 326
Hirzel, S., 328
Historical research, methods of, 139–141
Historical study of epic, problems of, 591–614; §§ 11, 12, *passim*
Historical study of lyric, problems of, 137–149; §§ 5, 6, *passim*, as 184, 190, 193, 197–198, 200, 206, 207, 208, 214, 215–217, 220, 221–222, 228, 233, 251–252, 256–258, 259–260, 262, 263, 267, 269, 271–272, 276–277, 280–284, 291 ff., 314, 318, 357, 358–359, 364, 366, 369–374, 375–376, 377–380, 382–385, 386–394, 396–397, 399–412, 414, 416–418, 421–422, 521, 571, 616, 619, 620, 621, 623, 625, 628, 629, 630, 631, 633, 634, 640, 650, 675, 680–681, 682, 683–685, 690–701, 702–704, 706–707, 714–716, 721–722, 726, 730–731, 737–738, 740–743, 745, 746, 754–756, 761, 767–768, 781–782, 782–783
Historical-scientific method and movement in criticism: lyric,

107–111, 118, 123, 133–136, 137–422 (for details see Table of Contents), 162, 165, 166, 168, 180, 181; epic, 428–430, 468–469, 531, 533, 540, 545, 546, 548, 549, 550, 554, 557, 565, 568, 570–572, 580, 581–582, 584–585, 587, 591–783 (for details see Table of Contents), 633–634, 645, 650, 667, 671
Hjärne, R., 345
Hobbes, T., 113, 466, 478, 561–562
Hobein, H., 513
Hobhouse, J. C., 244
Hobhouse, L. T., Wheeler, and Ginsberg, 370, 373, 374
Hochberg, W. H. von, 578
Hocker, O., 752
Hodgkin, T., 688
Hodgson, 126
Hoeft, C. T., 705
Hölderlin, J. C. F., 331, 408, 409
Hölty, L. H. C., 325, 408, 409
Höpfner, E., 317, 320
Hoesslin, J. K. von, 135
Hoffmann, A., 739
Hoffmann, F., 762
Hoffmann, O., 274
Hofmannswaldau, C. Hofmann von, 319, 408
Hogarth, D. G., 677
Hogg, 280, 284, 294, 296
Hogg, T. J., 301
Holberg, L., 347, 351, 772
Holländer, S. A., 345
Holland, 306
Hollway-Calthrop, H. C., 233
Holm, 614
Holst, 330
Holt, L. H., 740
Holtzmann, A., 756, 780, 781
Holz, A., 134, 135, 332, 334, 335
Homer (texts, translations, commentaries, scholia, concordances), 678–679
Homeric age, the, 675–678
Homeric hymns, 184, 418
Homeric poems, 4, 29, 325, 425, 438, 454, 455–456, 457, 458, 461, 462, 463, 464, 465, 467–468, 469, 470, 473, 479, 481, 487, 491, 492, 494, 495, 497, 498, 499, 500, 504, 505, 508, 509, 510, 511, 512, 514, 515, 516, 517, 518, 519, 521–522, 523, 524, 526, 527, 528, 529, 530, 531, 532, 533, 534, 536, 537, 538, 539, 542, 543, 544, 545, 546, 547, 548, 549, 550, 551, 552, 553, 556, 560, 561, 562, 565, 566, 567, 568, 569, 571, 573, 574, 575, 576, 578, 579, 580, 581, 582, 583, 584, 587, 593, 594, 595, 596, 598, 601, 602, 603, 617, 619, 622, 627–628, 632, 634, 637, 638, 641, 649, 650, 651, 654, 656, 660, 663, 665, 668–679, 680, 681, 682, 683, 684, 685, 686, 693, 703, 704, 707, 716, 719, 720, 724, 726, 737, 746, 754, 764, 766, 774
Homeric Question, 531–532, 540, 546, 548–549, 553, 560, 581–582, 584–585, 594–595, 599, 616–617, 621, 623, 627–628, 635, 638, 641–642, 649, 650–651, 655, 656, 658–659, 660, 661–662, 664–665, 666–667, 668, 669–675, 737, 756, 758
Hommel, E., 782
Homostrophic ode, 420
Honegger, J. J., 134, 135, 334
Hood, Thomas, 294, 295
Hood, Tom, 16
Hooft, P. C., 337, 338
Hoogvliet, A., 766
Hook, 295
Hooper, W., 131
Hopkins, E. W., 361, 779, 780
Horace, 87, 100, 113, 130, 137, 190, 191, 193, 196, 216, 218, 237, 241, 242, 245, 257, 276, 277, 323, 324, 384, 417, 418, 425, 426, 427, 435 *et passim*, 463, 465, 475, 494, 514, 521, 522–523, 528, 537, 538, 541, 543, 556, 558, 561, 562, 566, 572, 575, 576, 685, 694
Horatian ode, 18, 417, 419; *see also* Horace
Horn, F. W., 339, 340 *et passim*, 767, 769
Horn, P., 355, 356, 358, 360, 777, 778
Hornburg, 737, 739
Horne, 294
Horoy, 689

Horváth, C., 354
Hoskins, J. P., 141, 162, 636
Hostrup, J. C., 350
Houghton, 296
Housman, A. E., 291, 295
Housman, L., 291, 295
Houwaert, J. B., 765
Hovelacque, A., 360
Hovey, R., 742
Howells, W. D., 244, 301
Howitt, W. and M., 339, 340, 345
Hoyer, K., 328
Hrosvitha, 691, 701
Huart, C., 355, 361
Hubatsch, O., 202
Hubbard, M. G., 260
Huber, 399
Hucbald of St. Amand, 697
Huch, R., 333
Huchon, R., 287
Hudson, W. H., 59, 301, 478
Hübscher, J., 721
Hübschmann, H., 360
Hueffer, F., 210
Hüffer, H., 334
Huet, P. R., 492, 539, 541, 543
Hughes, A. M. D., 301
Hughes, J., 116
Hughes, T., 742
Hugo, V., 109, 163, 221, 223, 247, 400, 596, 600, 636, 654, 659, 712
Hull, Eleanor, 307, 749
Humboldt, W. von, 431 *et passim*, 474, 475, 479, 485, 582–584, 585, 600, 725, 765
Hume, D., 568, 670
Humorous lyric, 231, 240, 290, 295–296, 344, 347, 349
Hungarian poetry, *see* Magyar poetry
Hunt, Holman, 301
Hunt, Leigh, 120, 125, 294 ff., 453, 479
Hunt, L., and Lee, S. A., 59, 126, 266, 301
Huntington, F. D., 306
Huntington, G. P., 718
Hurd, R., 117, 287, 541, 564, 565, 567, 568–569, 573
Huret, J., 224
Hurgronje, C. S., 636
Hurst and Mackay, 124
Hurtado de Mendoza, D., 257, 410
Hussey, M. I., 363
Hustvedt, S. B., 480
Hutchinson, F. E., 279
Hutten, U. von, 576
Hutton, R. H., 126, 301
Huxley, H. M., 355
Huygens, C., 338
Huyssen, G., 335
Hyacinthus song, 15
Hyde, A. G., 279
Hyde, D., 291, 295, 307, 749
Hymn, 17, 89, 106, 112, 165, 176, 178, 185 ff., 189, 191–195, 204, 269, 283, 296, 306, 318, 319, 320, 321, 329, 335–336, 337, 341, 343, 346, 347, 357, 358, 361, 363, 364–366, 388, 389, 481, 657, 660, 663
Hyporcheme, 187

Ibn Tufail, 356
Ibsen, H., 351
Ibycus, 184, 185, 418
Icelandic poetry, 339–340, 481, 482, 767–770
Idericus, 387
Idyl, 25, 157, 186, 221, 239 ff., 288, 313, 323, 341, 342, 343, 344, 347, 349, 380, 384, 391, 396, 423, 439, 440, 443, 445–453 (nature, function, technique), 457, 460, 462, 464, 470, 472, 473, 475, 476, 477, 480, 483, 487, 490, 491, 495, 496, 498, 499, 500, 503, 603–604, 610, 611–614 (origin and development), 613 (list of poets), 653, 660, 663, 764, 765, 771, 772
Iglesias de la Casa, J., 260
Ignacio de Luzán, 259
Illusion and the lyric, 62; and epic, 483
Imbert, G., 240
Imbriani, V., 246, 248
Imitation in poetry, problems and examples, 108, 172, 190, 216, 228, 245, 252, 256 ff., 259, 262, 263, 269, 600–602, 610, 612, 680–681, 683, 693, 711, 715, 720, 723–724, 726, 745; *see also* Classicism, Classical lit., Homer, Pindar,

Anacreon, Ovid, Horace, Tibullus, Propertius, Virgil, Petrarch, etc., etc.
Immermann, K. L., 409
Immisch, O., 375, 597, 602, 637, 673
Imperial, F., 252
Incremental repetition, 442
Indian poetry, 361–363, 778–782
Inductive criticism, principles of, 140–141, 145
Infantes de Lara, 730, 732, 733
Infortuné (anon.), 99
Inge, W. R., 302
Ingelow, Jean, 295
Ingemann, B. S., 346, 349, 773
Intelligents, the (Norwegian), 351
Intuònate, 16
Irish Movement, 120, 292, 295
Irish poetry, *see* Appendix; *also* 290, 291, 306–309, 748–749
Isaac, H., 274
Isaiah, First and Second, 366, 411
Isidore of Seville, 88, 89, 518, 520
Italian poetry, 16, 225–248, 394–397, 419, 712–729

Jack, A. A., and Bradley, A. C., 302
Jackson, A. V. W., 358, 360–361
Jackson, J., 687
Jackson, V., 274
Jacobi, H., 780, 782
Jacobi, J. G., 17
Jacobowski, L., 59, 135, 145, 589, 593, 598, 637
Jacobs, F., 188
Jacobs, J., 624, 637, 701
Jacobus de Benedictis, 193
Jacoby, F., 163, 380
Jacopo d'Aquino, 228
Jacopo da Lentino, 228
Jacopone da Todi, 193, 229, 231
Jacopus de Voragine, 689
Jacquinet, P., 560
Jaeger, H., 351
Jähnicke, O., 752
Jagić, V., 775
Jalalu'd-Din Rumi, 357
James, R., 352
James, W., 9, 36
Jameson, F., 753
Jami, 357, 412
Jamyn, Amadis, 218, 398, 536
Janicke, K., 335
Janin, J., 109
Jansen, K., 740
Janssen, J., 327
Jantzen, H., 163, 315
Japanese poetry, 368–369, 415
Jasinski, M., 163, 420
Jasmin, J., 224
Jastrow, M., 782
Jeaffreson, J. C., 302
Jean d'Auton, 398
Jean de la Pérouse, 398
Jeandet, J. P. A., 218
Jeanroy, A., 145, 163–164, 209, 211, 212, 227, 229, 247, 315, 633, 647, 698
Jeanroy, Brandin, and Aubry, 206
Jebb, R. C., 183, 188, 189, 376, 497, 593, 594, 598, 637–638, 661, 666, 668, 673, 677, 678
Jeffrey, F., 120, 125, 302
Jennings, W., 367
Jensen, P., 597, 638, 782, 783
Jensen, W., 332
Jeremiah, 366, 394, 411
Jeremias, A., 782
Jerrold, M. F., 233
Jeske, G., 762
Jespersen, J., 164
Jevons, F. B., 164, 183, 376
Jiriczek, O. L., 752, 753, 755, 759, 760
Joachimi, Marie, 333
Jodelle, E., 217, 398
Joël, K., 59–60, 334, 335
Johannes Posthius, 203
Johannes Secundus, 203
Johnson, C. F., 60, 480
Johnson, L., 291
Johnson, S., 118, 287, 288, 289, 417, 444, 480, 484, 569, 747
Johnson, S., 778
Johnstone, P. de L., 782
Joly, A., 709
Jonas, F., 479
Jonckblaet, 624
Jonctijs, D., 338
Jones, E. C., 295
Jones, E. D., 118
Jones, E. O., 308

Jones, Henry, 302
Jones, O., 308
Jones, W. L., 743, 744
Jongleur, 212, 213, 594, 707, 708
Jonson, B., 276, 277, 279, 282, 403, 404, 417, 419, 559, 560, 561, 581, 610
Jónsson, F., 339, 768, 769–770
Jónsson, J., 767
Jordan, H., 677
Jordan, R., 268
Jordan, W., 331, 332, 335, 480, 481, 603
Jordi de Sant Jordi, 253
Joret, C., 633
Joseph, E., 315
Josephus, 669
Jouffroy, T. S., 60
Jowett, B., 513
Juan de Arguijo, 257
Juan de Castellanos, 410
Juan de la Cueva, 410
Juan de Mena, 252, 255
Jubainville, Arbois de, 306, 677, 748, 749
Jubinal, A., 212
Judges, Book of, 629
Juglares, 730, 731
Julian, J., 165, 194, 305
Jullien, B., 104, 546
Jung, H., 315
Juromenha, 734, 735
Jusserand, J. J., 270, 638, 741
Justin the Martyr, 519
Juvenal, 87, 515
Juvencus, 690, 693, 694, 695, 696

Kaalund, H. V., 350
Kabelmann, K., 565
Kaegi, A., 362, 363
Kästner, A., 408, 417
Kafka, L. M., 335
Kaftan, J., 352
Kahn, R., 124
Kalevala, 480, 603, 620–621, 640, 641, 659, 773–774 (translations, 774)
Kālidāsa, 362, 412, 590, 781–782
Kaluski, 354
Kaluza, M., 60, 419
Kames, Lord (H. Home), 568
Kammer, E., 673, 677
Kannegiesser and Witte, 230
Kant, I., 133
Karajan, 319
Karájich, V. S., 353, 606, 775
Karsch (Karschinn), Anna, 399, 409
Kassner, R., 287
Kastner, L. E., 167, 204, 219, 274, 421
Kattein, C., 446
Kautzsch, E., 364
Kāvya, 777, 779, 781–782
Kayser, J., 194
Keach, 283
Keats, J., 120, 125, 290 ff., 420, 452
Kebble, T. E., 288
Keble, J., 60–61, 296, 481
Keck, H., 760
Kedney, J. S., 61–62, 427, 449, 475, 481
Keene, C. H., 384
Kehmptgow, 681
Keidel, G. C., 638
Keightley, T., 574
Keil's Grammatici Latini, 88
Keinz, F., 314
Kelemina, J., 762
Kelle, J., 311
Keller, A. G., 677
Keller, G., 332
Kellgren, J. H., 342, 343, 344–345
Kennedy, C. W., 740
Kennedy, H. M., 660
Kennet, B., 114
Kent, C. F., 364, 365
Ker, W. P., 165, 192, 196, 208, 288, 302, 431 *et passim*, 467, 470, 481–482, 563, 594, 598, 599, 600 *et passim*, 636, 639, 689, 700, 705, 708, 739, 741, 752, 768, 770
Kerbaker, M., 246
Kerlin, R. T., 447, 614
Kernahan, C., 266
Kettner, E., 756, 760
Kind, J. L., 288
Kindermann, C. H., 686
King, E. G., 364, 365
King, H., 277, 405
King, L. W., 782
Kingo, T., 346, 347, 351
Kings, Book of, 629

Kingsley, C., 288, 296
Kinkel, G., 679
Kipling, R., 291, 294, 296, 297
Kircher, E., 328, 334
Kirchhoff, A., 649, 673, 678
Kirkpatrick, A. F., 365
Kittel, 365
Kittredge, G. L., 288, 441, 442, 605, 608, 609, 633, 639, 743, 744
Klaeber, F., 739
Klagelied, 210, 267, 406; *see also* Elegy
Klai, J., 319, 321
Klee, G., 760
Kléen, E., 344
Klein, 208
Kleinpaul, E., 62, 436, 482–483
Kleist, E. C. von, 323, 327, 331, 399, 408, 409, 417, 764
Klenker, F. J., 360
Klenze, C. von, 598, 639, 758
Klinger, F. M. von, 325
Klopstock, F. G., 324–327, 331, 343, 347, 408, 409, 417, 435, 469, 599, 601, 625, 690, 693, 729, 746, 763–764
Kluge, F., 635
Knaack, G., 413, 446, 483, 609, 612, 614
Knebel, K. L. von, 409
Knight, W., 302
Knight, W. P., 573
Knippel, R., 614
Knobloch, H., 210, 212
Knox, V., 118, 569
Koch, E. E., and Lauxmann, R., 336
Koch, M., 326, 327, 329
Koch, M., and Vogt, F., 329
Koch, T. W., 713
Köchly, H. A. T., 673, 681
Koegel, R., 311, 702
Köhler, A., 737, 739, 752
Köhler, R., 320
Köhler, R., 681
Koelbing, A., 270
Kölbing, E., 339, 762
König, E., 365
König, J. U. von, 322
König Rother, 751, 758, 760
Königsfeld, G. A., 194
Könnecke, 753
Köpke, R., 333
Köppel, E., 270, 274, 302, 421
Körner, J., 585
Körner, K. T., 331
Körter, W., 327
Körting, G., 209, 233, 261, 588, 639, 703, 709, 713, 725, 734, 747
Köster, A., 329
Köster, H., 188
Kolmatchevsky, 624
Kolson, A., 208
Koltzov, A. V., 353
Korn, 381
Kosegarten, 325, 408
Kostlivy, A., 406, 408
Kralik, R. von, 673
Kraus, F. X., 588, 714, 718
Krause, G., 321
Krause, K., 415
Krause, K. C. F., 450
Kreller, R., 589
Kremer, A. von, 356
Kressner, 611
Kretschmann, 408
Kriebel, H. E., 150
Kroeger, A. E., 312
Krohn, J., 598, 599, 600, 640, 659, 774
Kroll, W., 686
Krüger, G., 519, 688 *et passim*
Krumbacher, K., 191, 194, 381, 477, 682
Küchler, C., 339
Kühnemann, E., 328
Kürenberg, Der von, 313, 315, 756
Kürschner, 311, 321, 330 *et passim*
Küster, L., 669
Kuhns, L. O., 718, 725
Kunos, I., 355
Kunstlied, *see* Art lyric
Kurth, G., 708, 752
Kurtz, B. P., 508, 592, 593, 640
Kutcher, A., 328
Kynaston, 277

Labé, Louise, 398
Labitte, 718
Labouisse, 400
La Calprenède, G. de C. de, 465, 712

Lachèvre, F., 204
Lachmann, K., 314, 430, 594, 641, 671, 673, 755, 756, 760
Lachmann, K., and Haupt, M., 312
Lachmann-Dissenius, 381
Lacombe, P., 483
Lactantius, 517, 692
Ladd, G. T., 485
Ladoue, P., 397
Lafayette, Comtesse de, 543
Lafenestre, G., 219
La Fontaine, J. de, 103, 219, 220, 399, 624
Lagerlöf, P., 341
La Harpe, J. F. de, 106, 108, 554
Lai, 16, 101, 181, 206, 207, 214
Laing, M., 288
Laistner, L., 739
Lamare, C., 735
Lamartine, A., 34, 109, 221, 223, 302, 400, 712
Lamb, C., 295
Lambert, L., 225
Lamentations, Book of, 411
Lamenti, 395–396; *see also* Elegy
Lamotte, H. de, 22, 104, 464, 492, 543, 545, 546–547, 548, 551, 579
Lampoon, 184
Landau, M., 93, 240
Landor, W. S., 290 ff., 439, 452, 573
Lane, W. C., 713
Lang, A., 127, 168, 217, 291, 295, 296, 302, 370, 371, 373, 438, 483, 533, 593, 598, 608, 641–642, 649, 659, 672, 673, 677, 679, 754, 756, 774
Lang, Leaf, and Myers, 678
Lang, H. R., 249, 255, 265
Langdon, S., 363, 782
Lange, G., 673, 679
Lange, K., 62, 483
Lange, R., 368
Langland, W., 557, 638
Langley, E. F., 229–230
Langlois, C. V., 202, 710
Langlois, E., 97, 99, 212, 706, 711
Lanier, S., 63
Lanman, 362
Lannoy, Baroness de, 338
Lansdowne, Lord (G. Granville), 116
Lanson, G., 204, 209, 219, 223, 459
Lanstad, 345
Lappenberg, J. M., 327
Lappish poetry, 352
Laprade, V. de, 109
La Rue, Abbé de, 708, 710
La Rue, C. de (Ruaeus), 543
La Rue, G. de, 213
Lasca, 236
Lassberg, 753
Lassen, H., 352
Latin poetry, medieval, 201–204, 227, 269, 270, 385–389, 413, 688–702
Latomus, J., 576
Laucherts, 701
Laude, 229, 231, 233, 236, 237
Laudun d'Aigaliers, 101
Lauer, J. F., 673
Laumonier, P., 101, 218
Launis, A., 774
Laurand, L., 668, 673
Laurenza, V., 238
Laveleye, E. de, 598, 599, 642, 758, 770
Lavoix, H., 213
Lawrence, D. H., 291
Lawrence, W. W., 740, 741
Lawton, W. C., 643, 677
Lay, epical, 428, 482, 582, 584, 594–595, 598, 609, 620–621, 625, 632, 635, 636, 638, 640, 646, 663, 671, 697, 703, 726, 731, 737, 742, 750, 751, 756, 767, 774, 778, 779, 783
Layamon, 742, 744
Leaf, W., 594, 643, 648, 649, 673–674, 677, 678
Leahy, A. H., 749
Lear, Edward, 296
Leather, Mary S., 288
Léautaud, P., *see under* Bever, A. van, and Léautaud, P.
Le Bon, G., 593
Le Bossu, R. P., 138, 426–427 *et passim*, 456, 457, 458, 480, 484, 539, 540, 543, 544, 545, 547, 549, 551, 553, 558, 563, 564, 565, 566, 567, 578, 666
Lebrun, C. F., 553
Lebrun, E., 104

Lebrun-Pindare, P. D. É., 105, 220, 400, 416
Lechleitner, F., 315
Le Clerc, J., 544–545
Leconte de Lisle, 46, 222, 400
Lee, S., 25, 128, 219, 274, 421
Lee, V., 93, 241, 302
Leendertz, P., 338
Lees, J., 309
Leeuwen, J. van, 674
Lefranc, A., 218
Le Franc de Pompignan, 105
Lega, G., 231
Le Gallienne, R., 128, 291, 294, 302
Leger, L., 775
Legge, J., 367
Le Goffic, C., 374, 453
Legouis, E., 302
Legouvé, 400
Legrand, P. E., 378, 446, 614
Legras, 688
Legrelle, A., 351
Lehmann, R., 132, 134, 135, 589
Leiche, 181, 200, 212, 418
Leichtlen, J., 756
Leitzmann, A., 761
Le Maire de Belges, J., 398
Lemaître, J., 110
Lemcke, C., 134, 317, 589
Lemcke, L., 600, 643
Lemène, 239, 241, 243
Lemnius, S., 576
Lemos, M., 735
Le Moyne, Le Père, 538, 541, 562, 711
"Lenau" (Strehlenau, N. von), 331, 409
Lenient, C., 224
Lennep, 338
Lenngren, Anna M., 343
Lentzner, C. A., 165, 274, 421
Lenz, J. M. R., 326
Leo, F., 189, 381
Leo, H., 739
Léonard, 400
Leoni, E., 735
Leonidas of Tarentum, 414
Leonio, V., 395
Leopardi, G., 233, 244, 246, 247, 302, 397
Leopold, K. G. af, 342
Le Petit, J., 204
Lérmontov, M. V., 353
Lesbian or Aeolic lyric, 184, 417, 418, 419
Lescurel, J. de, 210
Lessing, G. E., 32, 132, 325, 327, 328, 417, 475, 580–581, 585
Lessing, O. E., 335
Letourneau, C., 165, 643
Le Tourneur, 399
Leuthold, H., 223, 332, 334
Levati, E., 244
Lever, 295
Levertin, O., 344
Levi, E., 229, 234, 236
Levi-Malvano, E., 243
Levin, J., 352
Levy, P., 165
Levy, R., 320, 415
Lewent, K., 210
Lewes, G. H., 121, 329
Lewis, C. M., 63
Lewis, G. C., 487
Leyden, J., 742
Leyser, P., 89, 702
Libius Disconius, 569
Lichtenberger, E., 328
Lichtenberger, L., 753, 755
Licinus, 414
Lidner, B., 343
Liebenberg, F. L., 352
Liebusch, G., 327
Lieder-Theorie, 585, 586, 594, 598, 621, 625, 631–632, 635, 636, 639, 640, 641–642, 646, 647–648, 650–651, 658–659, 664, 667, 669–675, 731, 737, 739, 756, 760
Liliencron, R. von, 319, 336
Lillge, F., 674
Lilly, M. L., 485, 643
Lindblad, E. W., 344
Lindsay, W. M., 196, 518
Ling, P. H., 343, 771
Lintilhac, E., 209, 494
Linus song, 15
Lippi, L., 729
Lipscomb, H. C., 688
Literary criticism, rise in Greece, 508–509
Literary epic, *see* Epic, natural versus artificial; *also* 430, 488,

497, 574, 601, 604 (list), 663, 680–681, 684, 744–748, 763–766, 770–773, 778–782
Littératures populaires de toutes les nations, 165
Littlebury and Boyer, 549
Littmann, 356
Lityerses song, 16
Litzmann, B., 328
Liverani, A., 686
Livius Andronicus, 682–683
Livy, 497
Ljunggren, G., 344, 345
Lloyd, M., 165, 365, 401, 403
Llywarch Hen, 402
Lobo, F. A., 735
Lobo, R., 410
Lockhart, J. G., 120, 255, 302
Locke, J., 115, 550
Locker-Lampson, F., 32, 63, 266, 295
Lodge, T., 610
Loebe, R., 692
Löbell, J. W., 328, 764
Lönnrot, E., 621, 773
Loeper, G. von, 328
Logau, F. von, 318, 417
Lohenstein, K. von, 319, 321, 341, 408
Lohre, H., 485
Loise, F., 485, 593, 599, 600, 643–644, 713
Loiseau, 261
Lollis, C. de, 229, 230
Lombard, A., 550
Lombardi, A., 240
Lomonosov, M. V., 353
Londonio, C. G., 246
Long, J. D., 687
Longepierre, Baron de, 492
Longfellow, H. W., 166, 249, 261, 337, 340, 345, 346, 748
Longinus, 87, 119, 137, 459, 465, 475, 509, 512, 513
Longnon, H., 218
Longus, 610
Lonsdale and Lee, 687
Loots, C., 766
Lope de Moros, 251
Lope de Vega Carpio, 410
Lopes de Mendonça, 265
Lopez, Pero, 251
Lopez de Mendoza, I., 252, 255
Loth, J., 309
Lotspeich, C. M., 770
Lotze, H., 63, 431 *et passim*, 485, 600
Louis le Laboureur, 711
Lovelace, 276
Lover, 295
Lowell, J. R., 296, 302, 420, 742
Lower races, poetry of, 369–374, 411, 421, 478, 591–593, 598, 607, 627, 628, 629, 633, 637, 640, 644, 645, 647, 649–650, 654, 663, 783
Lowndes, 288, 308
Lowth, R., 117, 365, 453
Loyson, C., 400
Lubbock, Sir J., 373
Lucan, 458, 516, 517, 566, 601, 660, 687, 712
Lucas, St. John, 205, 226
Luce, M., 302
Luce, S., 705, 728
Luce de Lancival, 712
Lucian, 414
Lucidor, Lars, 341
Lucilius, 382
Lucillius, 414
Lucretius, 191, 429, 516, 660, 692, 694
Ludlow, J. M., 752, 758, 760
Ludwig, A., 362, 781
Ludwigslied, 750
Lüderitz, A., 315
Lüning, O., 739
Lütjens, A., 644, 752
Luiken, J., 337
Lull (or Lully), R., 253, 255
Lundius, B., 202
Luquiens, F. B., 705
Luther, M., 129, 318, 576
Luzio, A., 722
Lycophron, 453
Lydgate, 270
Lyell, C., 232
Lynn, M., 280
Lyon, 316
Lyric, classification of, 34–35, 135, 138
Lyric, definitions of, 3–8; §§ 1–6, *passim*

Lyric, function of the, 35–40; §§ 1–3, *passim*
Lyric, its song-like quality, 6–7
Lyric, theory and history of, 3–422 (for details, *see* Table of Contents)
Lyric and epic, priority in development, 143, 144, 151, 158, 159, 163, 168, 169, 176, 178, 181, 184, 373, 485, 489, 502, 503, 591–593, 595, 625, 629, 636, 637, 638, 648, 654, 659, 663, 667
Lyric and idyl, interrelation, 447–448
Lyric as essence of poetry, 7, 9, 52, 55, 60, 107
Lyric poets, references: Afghan, 355; Babylonian-Sumerian, 363, 412; Byzantine, *see* Greek; Celtic, 306–309; Chinese, 367–368; Danish-Norwegian, 345–352; Dark Ages, 88–89, 191–201, 385–389, 413; Dutch, 337–338; Egyptian, 364; English, 111–129, 265–306, 401–406, 416–417, 419–420; French, 97–111, 204–225, 392–393, 397–401, 416, 419; German, 129–136, 309–336, 406–409, 417; Greek and Roman, 85–88, 183–191, 374–385, 412–415, 418; Hebrew (Ancient), 364–366, 411–412; Icelandic, 339–340; Indian, 361–363, 412; Italian, 89–97, 225–248, 394–397, 419; Japanese, 368–369, 415; Lappish and Finnish, 352; Lower races, 369–374, 411, 421; Medieval Latin, 201–204; 227, 393; Modern Latin, 393–394, 415, 418–419; Oriental, 354 ff., 411–412, 415; Persian, 356–361, 412; Portuguese, 261–265, 410; Provençal, *see under* French, *also* 227–229; Russian, 352–353; Scandinavian (in general), 339; Serbian, Cheskian, Magyar, and Polish, 353–354; Spanish, 248–261, 410; Swedish, 340–345; Syriac and Armenian, 355; Turkish, 354–355
Lyrical narrative, 195, 197–198, 207, 373, 377, 378, 386, 440, 654, 691, 693–694, 697, 767, 773; *see also* Ballad, Epic, and Lyric
Lytton, Lord, 742

Maack, R., 288, 614
Mabilleau, L., 223
MacAlister, R. A. S., 744
Macaulay, G. C., 288
Macaulay, T. B., 48, 285, 288, 294, 296, 302, 443, 464, 485, 572, 644, 747
Macbean, L., 308
Maccallum, M. W., 743, 763
Macculloch, J. A., 593, 598, 644
Macdonell, A. A., 362, 590, 781, 782
Macdowall, M. W., 758
Macer, 683
Macgilwray, J., 452
Machaut, G. de, 214
Machiavelli, 235
Machines, epic, *see* Marvelous
Mackail, J. W., 25, 32, 64, 166, 302, 413, 444, 486, 614, 644, 674, 678, 681, 683, 687
Mackay, 280
Mackenzie, A. S., 593, 598, 645
Mackenzie, John, 308
Mackie, A., 302
Maclean, Magnus, 308, 749
"Macleod, Fiona," *see* Sharp, W.
Macleod, M. C., 308
MacNeill, J., 749
Macpherson, J., 283, 286, 289, 308, 533
Macri-Leone, F., 234, 610, 645
Macrinus, J. S., 418
Macrobius, 87, 515, 541
Madden, Sir F., 744
Madius (=V. Maggi?), 523
Madrigal, 16, 169, 173, 179, 215, 226, 233, 238, 271, 273, 274, 275, 321, 398
Maerlant, J. van, 337, 765
Maeterlinck, M., 224
Maetzner, E., 212
Maffei, A., 244
Maffei, S., 94, 532
Magalhães, G. de, 736
Maggi, C. M., 239, 241
Maggi, V., 524
Maggiolate, 16

Magical song, *see* Charms
Magnier, L., 686
Magnus, L. A., 775
Magnusson, E., and Morris, W., 339, 770
Magrim, G., 240
Magyar (Hungarian) poetry, 353–354, 775
Mahābhārata, 505, 778–781 (translations, 779–780)
Mahaffy, J. P., 166, 376, 651
Mahn, C. A. F., 205, 208
Maigron, L., 544
Maikov, A., 353
Mailath, Count, 354
Main, 290
Maitland, T., *see under* Buchanan, R.
Majoragius, 523, 524
Malaspina, Alberto, 227
Malcolm, Sir J., 778
Maldè, E. de, 727
Malecki, A., 354
Malherbe, F. de, 100, 102, 219, 399, 419, 618
Mallet, P. H., 770
Mallinātha, 590
Malmignati, A., 243
Malmignati, J., 728
Malmström, B. E., 340, 344, 345
Malone, E., 466
Malory, Sir T., 436, 742, 744
Malusa, P., 189
Mambrun, P., 426, 456, 486, 541, 566
Mameli, 244
Mamiani, 244
Manacorda, G., 320
Mancini-Mazarini, L. J. B., duc de Nivernais, 105, 399
Manesse, 312
Manfredi, 241
Mangan, J. C., 294, 307
Mango, F., 240
Manheimer, V., 321
Manitius, M., 166, 191, 645, 688 *et passim*
Manly, J. M., 141, 166, 645
Mann, M. M., 762
Manni, 245
Manoel de Portugal, D., 263
Manrique, Gomez, 252, 254
Manrique, Jorge, 252
Mantuan, 610, 649
Mantz, H. E., 645
Manuel, D. J., 263
Manuel, E., 400
Manuel de Villegas, 257
Manx poetry, *see* Appendix, *also* 306
Manzoni, A., 96, 244, 246, 397, 583, 727
Mapes, W., 202
Maranta, 523
Maratti, 243
Marcabrun, 208
Marcellus, Comte de, 681
March, Auzias, 253, 255, 261
March, F., 739
March, F. A., 194
March, Jaume, 253
March, Pere, 253
Marchand, Abbé C., 218
Marchesi, G. B., 528
Marchetti, 244
Marcus Aurelius, 509
Marden, C. C., 730
Mare, W. de la, 291
Mari, G., 89, 98
Marie delle Grazie, 765
Mariendichtung, 313, 346, 402, 406
Marin, F. R., 249, 260
Marinism, 238–240, 257–258, 341, 396, 527, 530
Marino (or Marini), 238–240, 319, 396, 500, 542, 728
Markham, C., 778
Marmontel, J. F., 22, 106, 416, 545, 551–552, 712
Marnix, F. van, 337
Marolles, M. de, 543
Marot, C., 99, 101, 167, 215 ff., 391, 397–398, 416
Marradi, G., 245
Marsan, J., 645
Marsh, A. R., 431, 444, 486, 599, 600, 645, 705
Marston, P. B., 291, 294, 295, 296
Marsuppini, 720
Marta, H., 92, 528
Martelli, P. J., 94
Marthiya, 357

Martial, 87, 100, 190, 320, 413, 415, 416, 515
Martin, E., 315, 624, 637, 760
Martin, Sir T., 381, 617
Martinengo-Cesaresco, Countess E., 167, 248
Martínez de la Rosa, 260
Martinez de Medina, 252
Martínez y Guertero, L. R., 260
Martinon, P., 167, 204, 215, 216
Martins, O., 735
Marty-Laveaux, 99
Maruffi, G., 725
Marvell, A., 277, 278, 419
Marvellous in poetry, 120, 323–324, 325, 424, 425, 426, 432, 437, 440, 454, 456, 457, 461, 462, 465, 467, 470, 473, 477, 483, 484, 493, 495, 501, 506, 507, 508–512, 514, 517, 530, 531, 532, 537, 539, 541, 542, 544, 546, 549, 550, 551, 552, 553, 554, 566, 567, 568, 576, 578, 600, 617, 619, 622, 630, 635, 640, 642, 680, 696, 708, 737, 740, 755, 773
Marzials, T. J. H., 291, 294, 296
Masefield, J., 291, 294, 295, 296, 297
Masing, W., 328
Mason, W., 283, 405, 419
Maspero, G., 783
Masqueray, P., 64, 189, 376, 378, 412
Massèra, A. F., 231
Massey, Gerald, 295
Massey, W., 568
Massing, H., 646, 708
Masson, D., 288, 302, 747
Másson, G., 168, 205
Mathnawī, 357
Mattei, L., 93, 528
Matthews, B., 128, 168
Matthias, T. J., 288
Matthisson, F., 310, 331, 408
Mattioli, L., 721
Maugain, G., 240
Maurer, O., 302
Maury, G. B., 327
Maury, J. M., 249
Maximianus, 384
Maximus Tyrius, 510, 513
May, C., 735
May-day fêtes and the lyric, 212
Mazzini, G., 97, 534
Mazzone, R., 238
Mazzoni, G., 95, 236–237, 240, 243, 244, 245, 246, 672, 727, 729
Mazzoni, J., 527
McBryde, J. M., Jr., 574
McCarthy, J., 307
McDougall, W., 258, 593, 601
McGillivray, 740
McGregor, Sir James, 308
McKin, J. M., 150
Mead, W. E., 744
Meaning versus rhythm in songs, 12, 142, 145–146, 155, 159, 372
Medici, Lorenzo de', 235, 236, 237, 396
Medico, Dal, 248
Medina, V., 260
Meier, J., 168, 486, 598, 646
Meineke, A., 378
Meiners, C., 132
Meistergesang, 316 ff., 407, 416, 764
Melanchthon, P., 415, 576
Melchior, F., 334
Meleager of Gadara, 414
Meli, G., 243
Melic verse, 184 ff.
Melissus, P., 320
Mellin de St. Gelais, 216, 218, 274, 398, 416
Melone, C. da M., 528
Melton, W. F., 279
Melzi, G., 723
Ménage, G., 492
Mendelssohn, M., 64–65, 132, 460, 580
Mendes dos Remedios, 261
Mendheim, M., 765
Menéndez y Pelayo, M., 136, 248, 255, 259, 732
Menezes, D. J. de, 263
Menge, 327
Menghini, M., 240
Mengin, U., 302
Menini, F., 93
Menzies, J., 740
Menzini, B., 93, 240, 395, 419, 527
Merbach, H., 739
Mercantini, 244
Mercier, L., 539, 546, 553, 554

Meredith, George, 291
Meres, F., 112, 556, 557, 561
Merian, J. B., 582
Mérimée, E., 258
Merk, C. J., 708
Merkel, R., 681
Merlet and Lintilhac, 705
Merobaudes, Flavius, 198, 386
Merrill, E. T., 381
Merrill, W. A., 194
Merry and Riddell, 678
Mess, A., 163
Messenius, J., 341
Mestica, G., 97, 233, 244, 247, 528
Metastasio, P., 241, 242, 395, 533
Metcalf, F., 339
Methodius, 192
Metrodorus, 509
Meursius, J., 669
Mexía, H., 252
Mey, 316
Meyer, E., 778
Meyer, F. H. A., 328
Meyer, G., 158
Meyer, Kuno, 306, 307, 309, 749
Meyer, P., 205, 206, 209, 210, 212, 490, 595, 625, 646, 708, 709
Meyer, R. M., 329, 330, 739
Meyerfeld, M., 288
Meyers, Ernest, 294
Meynell, Alice, 291, 295, 302
Meynell, E., 302
Mézières, A., 233
Michel, Ferd., 315
Michel, Francisque, 254
Michelangeli, L. A., 187
Michelangelo, 237, 396
Michiels, A. F., 107
Mickiewicz, A., 354, 775
Mickiewicz, L., 775
Miessner, W., 333, 334
Migne, J. P., 385, 518, 679, 689, 698
Miguel de Unamuno, D., 250
Mijatovich, E. L., 353
Mikkel of Odense, 346
Miklosich, F., 646, 775
Milá y Fontanals, 210, 249, 250, 255, 729, 730, 732, 733
Miles, A. H., 33, 290, 302, 306
Milhouard, A., 224
Mill, J. S., 121, 138, 302, 433 *et passim*
Millar, John, 570
Millar, J. H., 288
Millard, F., 742
Miller, A. B., 302
Miller, G. M., 111, 168, 431 *et passim*, 486, 557, 608, 646–647
Miller, J., 306
Miller, J. M., 325, 408
Millevoye, C. H., 109, 221, 397, 400
Millington, E. J., 496
Millot, C. F. X., 210
Mills, C., 728
Mills, L. H., 259
Mills and Darmesteter, 359
Milman, H. H., 365, 702
Milnes, R. M., Lord Houghton, 301
Milo, 388, 691, 697
Milton, J., 34, 276, 277, 278, 279, 282, 288, 293, 295, 322, 323, 391, 405, 418, 419, 424, 429, 438, 439, 453–454, 455, 457, 458, 463, 464, 469, 470, 473, 476, 480, 481, 485, 488, 491, 497, 499, 504, 505, 506, 551, 559, 560, 561, 562, 563, 564, 565, 566, 567, 568, 569, 570, 573, 574, 575, 578–579, 593, 594, 596, 599, 601, 603, 622, 636, 638, 667, 690, 693, 742, **745–748** (editions and translations, 745–746), 763, 764
Mimnermus, 184, 189, 376, 377, 378, 380
Minnesang, 149–150, 207, 228, 230, 310, 312–317, 332, 407, 416
Minoan culture of Crete, 676–678
Minor, J., 329
Minot, L., 269
Minstrelsy, 569, 571, 594, 595, 599, 619, 638, 640, 647, 667, 671, 672, 708, 726, 737, 751
Minto, W., 279
Minturno, Ant., 91, 100, 395, 426, 463, 522, 523, 524, 525, 576
Minucius Felix, 517
Miracles and Mysteries, 167, 397, 402
Miscellanies, English, 271, 273, 276
Mistral, F., 224

Mitchell, D., 308
Mittler, F. L., 320
Mitzana, R., 258
M'Kie, J., 286
Mockel, A., 224
Mock-heroic epic, 439, 457, 460, 469, 472, 483, 499, 500, 604, 712, 720–721, 724, 728–729, 772, 773
Moe, Bishop J., 351
Moebius, T., 767
Möller, 350
Möller, H., 737, 739
Mönckeberg, 327
Mörike, E., 332
Mörner, J. von, 647, 752
Moggride, W., 453
Mogk, E., 339, 345, 758, 767, 768, 770
Mohl, J. von, 777
Mohnike, G. C. F., 194
Moland, L., 708
Molesworth, Sir W., 478
Molière, 347
Molinier, A., 706
Molins, A. de, 261
Mollevant, 400
Molteni, E. G., 254, 265
Molza, F., 237, 396
Momigliano, A., 231
Mommsen, T., 682
Monaci, E., 97, 226, 227, 229, 265, 534
Mone, F. J., 194, 624
Monge, L. de, 438, 487, 705, 725, 732, 733, 758
Monier-Williams, Sir, 779, 781
Monnier, F., 697
Monnier, P., 235
Monro, D. B., 86, 438, 672, 674, 678, 679
Monro, H., 291, 295, 595, 596
Monro and Allen, 678
Montaiglon, A. de, 210
Montaiglon and Rothschild, 217
Montalvo, G. de, 733
Montaudon, Monk of, 208, 210, 250
Montégut, E., 110, 223
Montemayor, J. de, 444, 610
Montesquieu, 104, 551
Montgomerie, A., 274
Montgomery, Guy, 374
Montgomery, H. R., 307
Montgomery, James, 296
Monti, G., 302
Monti, V., 96, 243, 244, 246, 534, 729
Moody, W. V., 296, 420
Mooney, G. W., 681
Moore, E., 232, 718
Moore, G. F., 364
Moore, S., 740
Moore, T., 294, 295, 296, 302
Moore, T. S., 291, 294
Moorman, F. W., 168, 279, 647
Moorsom, R. M., 195
Moral purpose of the epic, 426, 465, 472, 484, 487, 489, 492, 506, 514, 520–521, 531, 537, 538, 544, 547, 548, 552, 556, 557, 559, 563, 567, 576, 644
Morandi, L., 95, 243
More, H., 115
More, Jacob, 288
More, P. E., 128, 291, 302–303, 749
More, Sir T., 415
Moreau, H., 400
Morel, J. de, 436
Morel, L., 288
Morel-Fatio, A., 219, 249, 256, 420
Morello, V., 247
Morf, H., 215, 420, 686, 723, 725, 729
Morfill, W. R., 353, 354, 774, 775
Morgan, B. Q., 315
Morgan, L. H., 370
Morhof, D. G., 130, 577, 669
Morley, H., 265, 307, 702, 739, 748, 749
Morley, John, 303
Mornet, D., 614
Morpurgo, A., 238
Morrice, J. C., 309
Morris, Lewis, 294, 433, 488, 603, 748
Morris, William, 290 ff., 339, 420, 603, 678, 687, 743, 748, 770
Morsolin, B., 238, 524
Morton, E. P., 288
Morungen, H. von, 207
Moschus, 186, 379, 380, 391, 483, 610, 649
Motet, 200, 206, 207

Motherwell, W., 168, 284, 296
Mott, L. F., 210, 274, 718
Motteau, 687
Motz, H., 676
Moulton, J. H., 356, 360
Moulton, R. G., **65–66**, 149, 365, 415, **487**, 592, 604, 605, 612, **647–648**
Mucha, O., 218
Mülder, D., 674
Müllenhoff, K., 311, 737, 739, 756, 760
Müllenhoff and Scherer, 311
Müller, A., 270
Müller, C., 321
Müller, C. H., 312
Müller, E., **487**, 588
Müller, F., 373
Müller, I. von, 189, 191 *et passim*, 588
Müller, K. O., **168**, 376, 431, **487**, 586, 648, 675
Müller, M., 354
Müller, Max, 333, 359, 362, 363
Müller, N., 739
Müller, Wilhelm (poet), 331, 333
Müller, Wilhelm, 597, **648**, 752, 755, 756
Müller, W. M., 364
Münnich, 354
Münscher, K., 510
Mützell, J., 336
Muir, J., 362
Mulgrave, Earl of, 114, **562**
Muller, H. C., 574
Mullinger, J. B., 697
Mullinger and Masterman, 747
Multineddu, S., 727
Munch, A., 351, 773
Muncker, F., 327, 328, 764
Munford, W., 678
Muoni, G., 243, 246, 727
Muratori, L. A., 94, 491, **530–531**
Mure, W., **169**, 376, 593, **648**, 674
Muret, M., 244
Murillo, 249
Murray, G., 128, 418, 575, 598, **648–649**, 674, 677, 683
Musaeus, 682
Music and poetry, 42, 62, 63, 106, 117, 127, 142, 143, 156, 159, 180, 187, 189, 209, 213, 218, 268, 271, 273, 274, 275, 374, 375, 378, 389, 622
Musical accompaniment, 4, 11
Muspilli, 750
Musset, A. de, 221, 223, 400
Musset, P. de, 223
Mustard, W. P., **649**
Muth, R. von, 753, 755
Mutinelli, 396
Muzio, G., 91
Myers, E., 513, 678
Myers, F. W. H., 291, 294, 295, 303, 487, 684
Myers, Irene, 423, 425, 430, 459, 463, 488, 494, 503, 520, 575 *et passim*, **649–650**
Mynster, C. L. N., 352
Myres, J. L., 677
Mysticism and poetry, 286, 287, 300, 302, 304, 331, 343, 349, 357, 359, 360, 361, 402, 405, 407, 409, 412, 437, 510, 511, 520, 622, 691, 695, 699, 718
Myth (origin, distribution, preservation, etc.), 626
Myth in epic, 432, 457, 459, 460, 461, 463, 480, 481, 482, 489, 495, 507, 508–509, 517, 518, 530, 531, 538, 549, 550, 561, 567, 584, 597–598, 599, 619, 626, 629, 637, 642, 648, 656, 659, 660, 662–663, 680, 693, 737, 739, 740, 754, 755; *see also* Marvellous

Nadler, J., 333
Nadrowski, R., 758
Nägelsbach, C. F. von, 677
Naevius, 414, 683, 685
Nagel, W., 614
Nageotte, E., 183
Nagl, J. W., 753
Nairne, Lady, 284
Napolski, M. von, 208
Nardi, Jacopo, 235
Nash, D. W., 749
Nash, T., 112, 557
Naso, 388
Natali, G., 243
Naturalism, 46, 108, 260, 264, 292, 332, 344, 397, 409

Nature, poetic treatment of, 147, 188, 189, 199, 209, 267, 277, 278, 279, 281–285, 288, 289, 291 ff., 315, 319, 322, 323, 328, 331, 348, 349, 350, 379, 387, 388, 399, 408, 448, 449–450, 452, 492, 574, 610, 613, 614, 676, 680, 685, 718, 738, 739
Nauck, A., 513, 678
Naylor, E. W., 274
Neale, J. M., 194
Neander, J., 319
Neboliczka, O., 130, 326, 327, 611
Neele, H., 573
Neff, K., 199
Neff, T. L., 210
Neff, W., 135
Negri, Ada, 245
Negri, G., 718
Negrisoli, I., 682
Negro songs, American, 150
Neidhart von Reuenthal, 314, 407
Neilson, W. A., 66–67, 169, 210, 270, 488
Neilson and Webster, 268
Nekrasov, N. A., 353
Nelle, W., 336
Nemesianus, 384–385, 391, 610
Nencioni, E., 727
Neoptolemus of Parium, 514
Nerval, Gérard du, 225
Nessler, K., 489
Nettement, A. F., 110
Nettleship, H., 86, 87, 436, 460, 488, 509, 514–515, 683
Nettleship, J. T., 303
Neukirch, B., 322
Neumark, 319
Nevinson, H., 633
Newberry, J., 117, 568
Newbolt, H., 291
Newell, W. W., 743
Newman, F. W., 455, 456, 678, 679
Newman, J. H., 295, 296, 300
Newman, L. I., and Popper, W., 366, 373
Newton, J., 283
Nibelungenlied, 461, 468, 481, 482, 487, 491, 505, 571, 584, 585, 593, 622, 625, 641, 642, 660, 663, 751, 753–759 (comparison with Homeric epics, 754; editions and translations, 757), 760
Nicander, 379
Niccolini, 244
Nichol, J., 288, 302
Nichols, J., 288
Nicholson, R. A., 355
Nicholson, F. C., 312
Nickel, W., 169, 315
Nicolai, C. F., 579, 580
Nicolai Secundus, J., 203
Nicolay, C. L., 258
Nicoll, W. R., and Wise, T. J., 303
Niese, B., 674
Nietzsche, F. W., 332, 334, 335, 344
Nigra, 247
Nisard, C., 169
Nisard, D., 109, 303, 688
Nisieli, U., 92, 529
Nitze, W. A., 710
Nitzsch, G. W., 595, 599, 635, 650–651, 664, 674
Nivard, 623
Nivernais, Duc de, *see under* Mancini-Mazarini, L. J. B.
Nizāmī, 777
Nobile, 244
Nobiling, O., 265
Noble, J. A., 25, 67, 302, 421
Nodier, C., 224, 400
Noel, 16
Noel, R., 302
Nöldeke, T., 355, 776, 777, 778
Nolhac, Pierre de, 233
Nomos, 15, 186
Nonnus, 667, 681–682
Noppen, C. L. van, 748
Norden, C. L. van, 338
Norden, E., 88, 686, 694, 702
Nordenflycht, Hedvig C., 342
Norse poetry, Old, 767–770
Norton, C. E., 232
Norwegian poetry, *see* Danish-Norwegian poetry
Notker Balbulus, 193, 200
"Novalis" (Hardenberg, F. von), 331, 333, 343
Novati, F., 202, 226, 227, 624, 702
Novery, R. de, 735
Nowack, W., 365

Noyes, A., 291, 294, 295, 296, 297, 303, 748
Noyes, G. R., and Bacon, L., 353, 606, 775
Nugent, T., 550
Nunes, J. J., 262
Núñez de Arce, 260
Nusch, A., 754
Nutt, A., 288, 308, 710, 743, 749, 762
Nutzhorn, H. F. F., 674
Nyberg, Julia, 343
Nyblom, 345
Nyrop, K., 651, 703, 705, 708

Objective attitude of poet in epic, 424 ff., 431, 441, 443, 454, 463, 469, 477, 487, 495, 496, 500, 502, 570, 586, 602, 667
Occasional lyric, 4, 142, 144, 164, 181, 186–187, 198–201, 205, 215, 251, 371–373, 378, 383, 386, 387, 388, 390, 393, 416, 418, 421; *see also* Elegy, Epigram
Ochoa, 734
Ochsenbein, W., 303
O'Curry, Eug., 306
"Odd, Orvar" (Sturzen-Becker, O. P.), 344
Ode, 17–22, 100 ff., 112 ff., 125, 130–131, 153, 216, 218, 219–220, 237, 238–243, 245, 259–260, 263, 276, 277–278, 281–282, 290, 296, 320, 323, 324, 327, 337, 338, 341, 351, 353, 357, 359, 367, 372, 417–420
Odel, A., 342
O'Donoghue, D. J., 290
Oegier, 336
Oehlenschläger, A. G., 346, 349, 350, 352, 771, 773
Oelsner, H., 232–233, 712, 718
Oertner, J., 135
Oettl, F., 687
Ogilby, 687
Ogilvie, J., 117, 405, 569
Ogle, G., 204
Ogle, M. B., 202, 208, 315
Oldenberg, H., 362
Oldham, J., 405
Oliphant, T., 169, 274
Oliviers, Flies des, 105
Olmstead, E. W., 169, 420
Olrik, A., 345, 488–489, 588, 772
Oman, J. C., 781
Omand, T. S., 455–456
Omar Khayyam, 357, 358, 360
Omond, T. S., 67, 288, 303
O'Neill, J., 749
Ongaro, F. dall', 245
Opitz, M., 129–130, 318, 319, 321, 323, 341, 346, 407, 409, 417, 419, 576, 763
Oporinus, 610, 613
Oral tradition, *see* Ballad, Saga, Lay, Gests; *also* 428, 431, 477, 582, 584, 594, 599, 605 ff., 623, 629, 636, 640, 663, 666, 749, 750, 768, 774
Orchard, T. N., 747
O'Reilly, Ed., 306
Orendel, 751
Oriental poetry, 34, 62, 146, 180, 189, 354 ff., 411–412, 415, 477, 505, 612, 614, 632
Orientius, 386
Origen, 518, 521
Origin of narrative and lyric poetry, 591–593
"Orinda" (Katherine Philips), 277
Orlandi, F., 246
Orr, Alexandra, 303
Orsi, G. G., 544
Orth, F., 210
Ortiz, R., 265
Osgood, C. G., 747
O'Shaughnessy, A., 291, 294
Ossian, Poems of, 283, 286, 288, 289, 308, 324, 325, 327, 343, 397, 399, 408, 530, 533, 570, 573, 582, 633, 634, 668, 670, 748, 749, 771
Ostrowski, C., 775
"O'Sullivan, Seumas" (James Starkey), 291, 295, 297
Oswald, 751
Oswald, J. G., 332
Otfried of Weissenburg, 750
Otto delle Colonne, 228
Otto, E., 739
Ottonaio, 235
Otway, T., 419
Ouseley, Sir G., 361
Ouvré, H., 170, 651

Ouwaroff, 681
Ovid, 87, 101, 105, 182, 184, 190, 191, 210, 216, 241, 252, 255, 257, 379, 381, 382–384, 388, 393, 394, 395, 400, 406, 414, 515, 696, 709
Owen, D. E., 274, 421
Owen, or Owenus, J., 179, 329, 415, 416
Owen, S. G., 381
Owen, W., 309, 402
Oxford History of Music, 17
Oxford Movement, 292
Ozanam, A. F., **231**, **694**, 699, 718, 719

Packard, L. R., 672
Pacuvius, 414
Padelford, F. M., 92, 270, 272, 274, 275, 421, 494, 513
Paean, 185
Páez de Ribera, R., 252
Pagano, A., 240
Page, C. H., 290, 298
Pagès, A., 255
Palacio, M. del, 260
Paldamus, 310
Paléologue, M., 223
Palesi, F., 94
Paley, F. A., 418, **651**, **674**, 681
Palgrave, F. T., 6, **67**, 127, 170, 266, 272, 278, 284–285, 297, 302, 306, 574
Palladas, 414
Palmer, 381
Palmer, G. H., 279, 679
Palmer, R., 306
Palonski, 353
Paludan-Müller, F., 350, 352, 773
Panegyric, 197-198, 200, 243, 367, 382, 383, 386, 387, 388, 403, 406, 407, 416, 481, 691
Panizzi, A., **651**, 722
Pantoum, 16
Panzacchi, 245
Panzer, F., 431, 489, 588, 627, **652**, 758, 760, 762
Papillon and Haigh, 686-687
Paquet, 330
Parable, 439, 472, 500, 663
Paradise Lost, *Regained*, *see* Milton
Parallelism, 200, 373
Paraphrase, metrical, of Bible, 690, 693, 694, 740, 750
Parducci, A., 214
Parini, G., 240, 241–242, 243
Paris, G., 145, **170**, 205, 209, 211, 214, 595, 610, 623, 624, 633, 646, 647, **652**, 701, **705**, 708, 709, 710, 723, 730, 741 *et passim*
Paris, G., and Langlois, E., 212
Paris, G., and Myer, P., 431 *et passim*, 489–490
Paris, P., 211, 624, 702, **708**, 710
Parmenides, 475, 516
Parnassiens, 108, 222, 260, 264
Parnell, T., 282, 288, 417, 611
Parny, E. D. de Forges, Vicomte de, 220, 400
Parode, 189
Paroenia, 15
Parrot, H., 417
Parry, J., 309
Parseval de Grandmaison, 712
Partheneia, 186
Parthenius of Nicaea, 379, 383
Parzanese, 244
Parzival, 625, 762
Pascal, C., 227
Paschal, G. W., 681
Pascoli, 245
Pasquier, É., 541
Pastonchi, 245
Pastoral elegy, 378 ff., 384, 391–392
Pastoral epical poetry, 423, 439, 440, 443–445 (nature and function), 446 ff. (idyl), 454, 462, 467, 470, 472, 473, 476, 477, 480, 485, 490, 500, 514, 521, 530, 561, 575, 609–611 (origin and development), 612, 618, 626, 635, 643, 645, 647, 649, 655, 657, 660, 665
Pastoral lyric poetry, 30, 102, 116, 118, 157, 161, 168, 181, 209, 234, 237, 239 ff., 256, 262 ff., 268, 271, 272, 275, 276, 278, 279, 319, 321, 326, 337, 350, 378, 386, 387, 391–392, 397, 404. *See further under* Pastoral epical poetry
Pastourelle, 16, 30, 207, 210, 211, 212, 214, 269, 314, 610
Pastrello, F., 493
Patard, M. V., 214

Pater, W., 122, 127, 294, 303, 713
Paterno, L., 395
Patin, H. J. G., 191, 614, 683, 688
Patmore C., 21, 67, 291, 295, 296, 301, 420
Paton, W. R., 188
Patricius, *see* Patrizzi, F.
Patriotic lyric, 224, 244–245, 260, 264, 266, 269, 296, 323, 327, 331, 335, 344, 348, 350, 366, 375, 400, 407
Patrizzi, F., 490, 523, 526, 529, 568
Patterson, F. A., 270
Patterson, F. T., 308
Patterson, W. M., 124
Pattison, M., 67, 574, 747
Patzak, B., 415
Patzig, H., 758
Pau de Bellviure, 253
Paul, H., 170–171, 266, 267, 311 ff., 314, 352, 652, 749, 756, 758 *et passim*
Paul, H. W., 303
Paulinus of Nola, 198, 385, 691, 694
Paulinus of Pella, 695
Paulinus of Périgueux, 691, 695
Paulus Diaconus, 388, 696
Payne, W. M., 303
Paz y Mélia, A., 254
Pazzi, 524, 541
Peacham, H., 113, 558, 560, 561
Peacock, T. L., 171, 295, 296, 303, 653
Pearch, G., 280
Pechel, R., 32, 67, 415
Peck, H. T., 68, 128, 575
Pedersen, C., 346
Pedo Albinovanus, 683
Pedro, D., 262
Pedro de Flores, 734
Pellegrini, F., 230
Pellegrino, C., 526, 528
Pelletier du Mans, J., 101, 102, 536
Pellico, S., 397
Pellissier, G., 99 ff., 106, 110, 217, 221, 535, 537, 711
Pellizzari, A., 230
Peltzer, B. J., 189
Pemberton, H., 567
Penitential lyric, 270; *see also* Elegy, Sacred lyric
Peper, W., 135
Pepöck, J., 754
Pèrcopo, E., 218, 230, 234, 238
Percy, Bishop, 283, 285, 287, 324, 564, 565, 569, 634, 653, 743, 770
Perés, R. D., 261
Pérez de Guzmán, F., 252
Perfetti, 241
Periodicals, English, 18th Century, 115
Periodicals, English, 19th Century, 119
Periodicals, German, 18th Century, 131
Perizonius, J., 669
Perrault, C., 103, 219, 459, 492, 493, 538, 540, 542, 543, 544, 662, 669–670, 712
Perry, E. D., 170, 183
Perry, T. S., 129, 288, 303, 317
Perry, W. C., 458, 677
Persian poetry, 356–361, 762, 776–778
Persius, 87, 515
Perticari, 244
Pervigilium Veneris, 190
Pesenti, A., 246
Pesta, H., 288
Peters, E., 701
Peterson, J., 567
Péteut, P., 550
Petit de Julleville, L., 99, 171, 213, 537, 703, 705, 708, 709 *et passim*
Petöf, A., 354
Petrarch and his influence, 172, 209, 216, 218, 223, 232–234, 236–237, 255, 256 ff., 271, 273, 274, 275, 276, 391, 395, 396, 398, 410, 500, 521, 523, 610, 719–721
Petrarchan sonnet, 23
Petri, O. and L., 341
Petrie, F., 783
Petrocchi, P., 246
Petronius, 87, 515
Petrus Lotichius, 203
Petsch, R., 171
Petzet, C., 335
Petzholdt, J., 713
Pfaff, F., 312
Pfeiffer, Emily, 291, 295
Pfeiffer, F., 314, 756
Pfizmaier, A., 368

Pflänzel, M., 219, 420
Phaer, T., 555, 556, 557, 687
Phanocles, 379
Phelps, W. L., 288
Philetas of Cos, 379, 380, 612
Philips, A., 282, 419, 611
Philips, J., 611
Philipson, E., 210
Phillimore, C. M., 233, 727
Phillimore, J. S., 381
Phillips, E., 114, 562
Phillips, S., 291, 295, 297
Phillips, W. A., 755
Philo Judaeus, 518, 521
Philosophical criticism, 132–133, 139 *et passim*
Philostephanus, 379
Philostratus, 510, 513
Philoxenus, 186
Phoenix, poems on, 692
Phosphorists, 343, 771
Photius, 679
Phrynicus, 377
Physiologus, *see* Beast epic
Piazza, S., 171–172, 413
Pica, V., 224
Piccioni, L., 243
Picco, F., 240, 705
Piccolomini, A., 523, 524, 541
Pichon, R., 381
Pickering, C. J., 361
Pico della Mirandola, 561
Pidal, P. J., 732
Pidal, R. M., 653, 729, 730, 731, 732, 733
Pier delle Vigne, 227–228, 230
Piergili, G., 246
Piéri, M., 172, 218, 236
Pierre de Laudun, 537
Pierre le Picard, 624
Pietro della Valle, 93
Pigna, G., 426, 490, 525, 526, 568
Pilatus, Leo, 719
Pillet, A., 212
Pinckert, 363
Pindar, 60, 79, 103, 113, 178, 181, 185, 188, 189, 358, 417–418, 508, 513, 515
Pindaric ode, 101 ff., 116, 117, 216, 217, 218, 219–220, 238–240, 277–278, 417–418, 419
Pindemonte, I., 397
Pinder, N., 190
Pineau, L., 340
Piñeyro, E., 260
Pinnecuick, 284
Pintor, F., 238
Piper, P., 312
Piquet, F., 762
Piron, A., 220, 416
Pischel, R., 781
Pischinger, A., 189
Pisistratus, redaction of, 669
Pitni-Piraino, V., 235
Pitra, Cardinal, 194
Pitré, 248
Piumati, A., 234, 246, 725
Pizzi, I., 361, 776, 777, 778
Plainte, 209, 392, 394, 395, 397, 398, 410; *cf.* 377, 379–380; *see also* Elegy
Planche, G., 109, 223
Planctus, 388–389; *see also* Elegy
Platen, A., 331, 333
Plato and his influence, 86, 90, 186, 218, 274, 508, 509, 510, 513, 517, 520, 545
Pléiade, 99–102, 215–219, 271, 273, 274, 398, 419, 535–537, 711
Plessis, F., 68, 380, 381
Plessow, M., 624
Pliny the Younger, 87, 515
Plot in epic, 435–436, 487, 503, 505, 530, 539, 552, 572, 586, 599, 601, 631, 691, 697–698
Plotinus, 510, 513
Ploug, C., 350
Plüss, H. T., 476, 490, 588
Plumptre, E. H., 232, 418
Plutarch, 87, 475, 510, 513, 520, 521, 669
Poe, E. A., 69, 82, 368
Poema de Fernán González, 730
Poerio, 244
Poeschel, H., 413
Poestion, J. C., 339
Poetic truth, 509, 544
Poetics, history of, 85
Poetry, definitions of, 41
Pohlenz, M., 380
Poitevin, 220
Poitiers, Count of, *see* Guillaume IX

Poletto, D. G., 713
Polish poetry, 353–354, 774–775
Political lyric, 15, 184, 187, 206
Poliziano (Politian, Politianus), A., 203, 204, 235, 396, 449, 521–522, 523, 610, 720
Pollak, L., 758
Pollen, J., 353
Pollok, R., 429
Pomairols, C. de, 223
Pommrich, 747
Ponce de Leon, L., 257
Pons, J.-F. de, 492, 547
Pons de Verdun, 416
Pont, Gratien du, 99
Pontano (Pontanus), J., 396, 415, 418, 515, 543
Ponticus, 683
Pontmartin, A. de, 109, 224
Pontoux, C., 398
Pontus de Tyard, 217, 218
Ponzian, G., 686
Poot, H. C., 338
Pope, A., 138, 281, 285, 286, 287, 288, 289, 322, 323, 341, 399, 405, 416, 419, 426, 452, 455, 484, 492, 532, 562, 564, 566, 567, 568, 579, 610, 611, 614, 634, 678
Pópovich, 353, 775
Popul Vuh, 783
Popular lyric, *see* Folk lyric
Porphyry, 510–511, 513, 521
Porta, C., 96, 244
Porter, J. A., 774
Porter, W. N., 368
Portman, M. V., 374
Portuguese poetry, 252–253, 261–265, 410, 734–736, 783
Posnett, H. M., 69, 141, 145, 172, 438, 456, 490, 593, 599, 600 *et passim*, 645, 649, 653–654, 659, 660, 781
Post, C. R., 255
Postel, C. H., 577
Postgate, J. P., 381, 384
Potez, H., 172, 397, 399, 400
Potgieter, E. J., 338
Potter, Dirk, 337, 765
Potthast, 698
Pound, L., 654
Praed, 294, 295
Pragmatic poetry, 40, 54, 132, 583
Pralle, G., 315
Pram, C. H., 772
Prati, 244, 245
Pratt, I. A., 782
Prayer, lyric Christian, 198, 200
Pre Agostino, 396
Prendergast, 678
Pre-Raphaelites, 120, 292 ff.
Prestage, E., 261, 263
Preston, H. W., 210
Preston, W., 118
Preti, 238
Priamel, 417
Priapea, 190
Price, R., 664
Price, T. R., 25, 128
Primitive song and story, 142, 144, 150, 155–156, 159, 160, 177, 180
Prince, J. D., 363
Prior, M., 116, 281, 285, 287, 289, 417
Prior, R. C. A., 346
Proba, 693
Probability in epic plot, *see* Marvellous in poetry; *also* 436, 454, 479, 508, 514, 524, 530, 550, 566, 572
Proclus, 86, 137, 679
Proculus, 384
Pröhle, H., 327
Proelss, J., 334
Prölss, R., 135, 334, 589
Progress, 506, 540
Propertius, 68, 101, 163, 190, 381, 382–384, 394, 400, 405, 414
Propriety, canon of, 100
Prosodion, 186
Prosody, 41
Proto, E., 725
"Prout, Father" (Francis Mahony), 217, 296
Provençal poetry, 16, 143, 174, 205–211, 227–229, 234, 250 ff., 262, 264, 269, 313–314, 315, 392–393, 395, 410, 416; revival of, 224
Proverb, 372, 663
Prudentius, 193, 197, 690, 691, 693–694, 695, 750
Prudhomme, *see under* Sully-Prudhomme

Prutz, R. E., 327, 331, 351
Psychological method in criticism, 123–124, 152, 155, 258, 262, 359, 479, 483, 490, 534, 591–593, 601, 658–659, 717–718; *see also* Creative imagination, psychology of
Psychology of imitation and invention, *see* Creative imagination; *also* 123–124, 601
Psychology of the simpler peoples, 373–374, 593, 658–659
Publication, method of and influence upon poetry, 185
Pucci, Antonio, 233, 234
Puccianti, G., 247
Pughe, F. H., 303
Pugliese, Rugieri, 228
Pulci, B., 236, 500
Pulci, Luca, 720, 721
Pulci, Luigi, 236, 651, 721, 729
Puranas, 781
Purchard von Reichenau, 691
Puschmann, A., 129
Pusey, Keble, and Newman, 690
Pushkin, A., 353, 774
Puttenham, G., 112, 426, 557, 558
Puymaigre, Count Théod. de, 255, 732
Pye, H. J., 439, 454, 570
Pyre, J. T. A., 303

Qaṣīda, 357
Qiṭʿa, 357
Quadrio, F., 69, 93–94, 172–173, 490–491, 530, 532, 564 *et passim*
Quarles, 276, 405
Quattromani, 92
Quellien, N., 309
Quental, A. de, 264
Querengo, F., 93, 528
Querol, V. W., 260, 410
Quevedo, F. de, 258, 410
Quiller-Couch, Sir A. T., 25, 69, 266, 290, 291
Quinet, E., 655, 677, 682, 708
Quintana, M. J., 249, 260
Quintilian, 87, 137, 384, 514
Quintus Smyrnaeus, 601, 681

Raban, 388
Rabb, Kate M., 491, 655
Rabirius, 683
Racan, H., 399, 541
Racine, J. B., 543
Radbod, 388
Radloff, V. V., 783
Radtke, G., 758
Radulphus, 194
Ragey, P., 203
Raimondi, F., 395
Rajna, P., 491, 534, 597, 616, 653, 655, 705, 708, 721, 722, 723, 725
Raleigh, Sir W. (Jr.), 288, 303, 572, 574, 747
Ralston, W. R. S., 775
Rāmāyana, 778–781 (translations, 780)
Rambach, A. J., 194
Rambaud, A., 655, 774
Ramler, K. W., 323, 327, 331, 409
Ramon of Toulouse, Pierre, 250
Ramsay, Allan, 275, 280, 284, 611
Ramsay, And. M., 549–550, 570
Ramsay, G. G., 381
Rand, E. K., 686
Randolph, T., 419
Ranieri, 247
Rankin, R., 753
Rapin, R., 426, 452, 491–492, 523–524, 540, 543, 558, 559, 562, 669, 681
Rapisardi, 245
Rasi, P., 375, 381
Rassmann, A., 752, 758
Ratzel, F., 373
Raunié, E., 221
Raverty, H. G., 355
Ravn, 346
Rawnsley, 296
Raymond, G. L., 492
Raynaud, G., 206, 211, 212, 213
Raynouard, F., 206, 208
Razzoli, G., 722
Reade, W. H. V., 719
Realistic movement, 330, 331, 332, 335, 344, 350
Redhouse, J., 355
Redi, F., 239, 240
Redondilha, 263
Reed, E. A., 361, 778
Reed, E. B., 69–70, 173, 265 ff., 275, 290

Reenberg, T., 347
Reeve, Clara, 543, 564, 565, 569–570, 655
Reflective poetry, 33–34, 184, 323, 334, 337, 338, 357, 373, 376, 390, 391, 394, 402, 404, 409, 440, 491, 604, 684
Refrain, ballad, 440, 658
Regnér and Lengblom, 344
Régnier, H. de, 224
Régnier, M., 219, 492
Régnier-Desmarais, F. S., 546
Regolo, 523
Rehengac, V. de, 106
Rehorn, K., 757
Reichardt, F., 760
Reichel, E., 326, 578
Reichel, W., 677
Reid, J., 308
Reina, M., 260
Reineke Fuchs, 623–624, 625
Reinhardstöttner, C. von, 735
Reinmar von Hagenau, 314, 407
Reinmar von Zweter, 314
Reinsch, H., 561
Reismann, A., 17, 310
Reisner, 363
Reissenberger, 624
Reissert, O., 635
Reitzenstein, R., 375, 376, 380, 412, 413, 614
Religious character of the epic, *see* Marvellous in poetry; *also* § 8, *passim*; *also* 506, 586, 599, 602, 617, 634, 662, 684, 685; *also* Christian religion and the epic
Renan, 307, 741
Renard, roman de, 623–624, 637, 701, 711, 763, 765
Renard, G., 110
Renascida, A. F., 262
Renier, R., 234
Rennert, H. A., 655
Renouvier, C., 223
Repetitions in epic, *see* Formulae, epic
Réquier, Guiraut, 209
Resende, A. F. de, 263
Resende, Garcia de, 263
Restori, A., 209
Reuchlin, J., 576
Reumann, R., 712
Réville, A., 758
Reynard the Fox, *see Renard, roman de*; *also Reineke Fuchs*
Reynolds, H., 561
Reynolds, M., 288, 303
Rhetoricians, English, 555
Rhetoricians, Greek, 512, 513
Rhetoricians, Roman, 514
Rhoades, J., 687
Rhyme, 196, 200
Rhys, E., 70, 173, 265 ff.
Rhys, Sir J., 741, 743, 744
Ribbeck, O., 515, 614, 686
Ribeiro, B., 263
Ribot, 124, 601
Ricci, A. M., 532, 729
Riccoboni, 523, 524, 541
Rice, W., 204
Richard Cœur de Lion, 211
Richardson, J., 567
Richardt, C., 350
Richey, A. G., 758
Richter, H., 288
Richter, J. P. F., 70, 125, 132, 446, 580, 581, 586, 589
Richter, J. W. O., 312
Richter, P., 686
Rickert, E., 270
Riddle, 171, 177, 198, 267, 268
Ridgeway, W., 598, 677, 755
Riedl, F., 354
Riese and Bücheler, 413
Rigal, E., 636
Rigault, H., 492, 563
Rigutini, G., 247
Riley, H. T., 687
Rimbault, E. F., 275
Rispetto, 16, 395
Rist, J., 318, 319, 321
Ritchie, Anne T., 303
Ritson, J., 173, 275, 280, 284
Ritter, O., 288
Ritter, R., 686
Ritter von Rittersberg, 354
Rivadeneyra, 248, 256, 259
Rivalta, E., 230
Robecchi, L., 247
Robert, 624
Robert, C., 674, 677
Roberthin, R., 318

Roberts, A., and Donaldson, J., 689
Roberts, H. D., 288
Roberts, W. R., 86, 87, 509, 512, 513
Robertson, F. W., 303
Robertson, J. G., 309, 329, 747
Robertson, J. M., 127, 303
Robin Hood, Gest of, 620, 632
Robinson, J. H., and Rolfe, H. W., 234
Robinson-Darmesteter, A. Mary F., 291, 294
Robortelli, F., 91, 523, 524, 541
Rocafort, J., 70, 106, 220, 492, 552, 611
Rocca, L., 719
Rochefort, G. B. de, 553
Rochester, Earl of (Wilmot, J.), 277, 419
Rod, É., 110, 123, 247, 303
Rodrigues de Sá e Menezes, J., 263
Rönning, T., 737, 739
Rördam, H. F., 351
Roethe, G., 314
Roetteken, H., 762
Röttiger, K. W., 762
Rogers, A., 776
Rogers, R. W., 363
Rogers, S., 294
Rohde, E., 174, 375, 376, 709
Roiron, F. X. M. J., 686
Roland, Chanson de, 481, 487, 489, 571, 575, 585, 593, 594, 622, 641, 646, 703–706 (editions and translations, 704), 721, 723, 726, 731, 732
Rolland, E., 171, 225
"Roll-calls" of the poets, 87, 492, 556, 560, 561
Rolleston, T. W., 291, 513
Rolli, P., 241, 243, 395
Rollin, C., 550–551
Roman de la Rose, 711, 765
Roman poetry, 5, 27, 189–191, 381–385, 412–415, 418, 682–688
Romanceiros, 410, 735
Romanceros, 250, 410, 733, 734
Romances, 25, 211, 212, 313, 357, 360, 439, 472, 473, 478, 481–482, 483, 486, 496, 503, 507, 525–527, 532, 540, 542, 543, 551, 565, 568, 569, 570, 603–604, 609, 611, 612, 639, 644, 645, 652, 663, 664, 690, 694, 697, 709–711, 730, 731, 732, 733, 735, 741–744, 750, 761–763, 765, 770, 773, 775
Romano, B., 87, 515
Romantic epic, 426, 462–463, 472, 483, 486, 490, 495, 496, 501, 503, 507, 522, 525–527, 530, 532, 568, 575, 632, 651, 720, 721–728, 733, 744–745, 751, 761–763, 777; *see also* Ariosto, Boiardo, Tasso, Spenser
Romanticism, 107, 115, 119–120, 130, 217, 219, 221–222, 224, 244–247, 260, 264, 281, 282, 283, 284, 287, 288, 291 ff., 325, 330 ff., 338, 343 ff., 348 ff., 353, 397, 400, 419–420, 456, 564, 634, 766, 771
Romanus, 192
Romizi, A., 725
Ronca, 203
Rondeau, 16, 110, 117, 129, 210, 212, 214
Rondel, 16, 129, 214, 269
Rondet de carol, 16, 207
Ronsard, P. de, 101, 112, 130, 167, 172, 215–218, 391, 398–399, 419, 426, 536, 537, 541, 576, 601, 622, 711
Roosen, B. C., 336
Root, R. K., 740
Rosa, Salvator, 239
Roscoe, T., 657
Roscoe, W., 566
Roscommon, Earl of (Dillon, W.), 562
Rosenbauer, A., 99
Rosenblüt, H., 317
Rosenhane, G., 341
Rosenkranz, K., 134, 412
Rosenplüt (Schnepperer), H., 417
Roses, poetry of, 399
Rosini, 526
Rosny, L. de, 369
Ross, Alex., 284
Ross, E. A., 258, 593, 601
Ross, R., 291, 295
Rossetti, C., 128, 294
Rossetti, D. G., 126 ff., 232, 290 ff., 405, 443, 719

Rossetti, G., 244, 245
Rossetti, M. F., 714
Rossetti, W. M., 303
Rossi, G., 240
Rossi, M., 238
Rossi, V., 90, 235
Roth, F. W. E., 194
Roth, R., 362
Rothe, 624
Rothe, C., 674
Rothen, A. C., 577
Rothstein, 381
Rothstein, J. W., 366
Rotter, C., 174
Rouge, I., 333
Rouget de Lisle, 220
Rousseau, J. B., 104, 220, 416, 419
Rousseau, J. J., 107, 289, 325, 326, 327, 343, 397, 545, 551, 670
Routh, B., 551
Routh, H., 288
Routh, J. E., Jr., 111, 739
Roux, A., 244
Rowbotham, J. F., 207, 728
Rowe, Eliz., 405
Rowe, N., 566
Rowley, T., *see* Chatterton, T.
Roy, C., 106
Royce, J., 303
Ruaeus (La Rue, C. de), 543
Rubāʿī (*rubáiyát*), 357
Rubieri, 226
Rubio y Lluch, A., 189
Rubió y Ors, J., 261
Rūdagī, 360
Rudel, Jaufre, 208
Rudolf von Fenis, 314
Rückert, F., 331, 333, 356, 361, 409, 777
Rückert, H., 760
Rücktäschl, T., 99 ff., 536, 537
Rueda, S., 260
Rühle, 611
Ruiz, J., 251, 254, 255
Rulhière, 416
Runeberg, J. L., 344, 345, 772
Ruodlieb, 750
Ruscelli, G., 91
Ruskin, J., 294, 444
Russell, G. W. ("A. E."), 291, 295
Russell, G. W. E., 304
Russian poetry, 352–353, 774–775
Rustico di Filippo, 228, 230
Ruth, Book of, 447, 613
Rýbnikof, P., 774
Rydberg, V., 344, 769
Ryder, A. W., 363, 779
Ryle, H. E., 364
Rymer, T., 491, 558, 560

Saʿadi, 357, 412
Saalschutz, 365
Saar, F. von, 409
Sabatier, 22, 106
Sabinus (cf. Ovid, *Ex. Pont.* iv, 16, 13–16), 683
Sabinus, G., 203
Sacchetti, F., 233, 234
Sachs, C., 210
Sachs, H., 317, 319, 576
Sachse, M., 210
Sacred lyric, *see* Hymn; *also* 150, 172, 176, 181, 184, 193, 205, 213, 228–229, 231, 236, 244, 251, 254, 267–268, 270, 276, 279, 283, 290, 295, 312–313, 318, 319, 320, 341, 343, 346, 347, 349, 357–358, 360, 361, 362, 363, 364–366, 372, 387, 402, 407, 432, 437
Sá de Miranda, F. de, 263, 410
Sadolet, J., 418
Saga, 428, 439, 470, 480, 481, 483, 488–489, 491, 500, 589, 598, 604, 619, 646, 650, 652, 653, 656, 660, 662, 663, 767–770, 774
Saint-Amant, M. A. de G., Sieur de, 419, 452, 541
Saint-Évremond, Seig. de, 432, 433, 492, 493, 539, 545, 579
Saint-Hyacinthe, T. de, 492, 548
Saint-Lambert, 399
Saint-Marc Girardin, 764
Saint-Sorlin, *see* Desmarets, J.
Sainte-Beuve, C. A., 47, 70–71, 99, 108, 122, 217, 218, 220, 223, 224, 288, 304, 439, 452, 492–493, 681, 778
Sainte-Palaye, J. B. de, 210, 728
Saints' legends, 626, 657, 658, 689, 691, 695, 697–698, 701
Saintsbury, G., 16, 22, 71–72, 86, 88, 111, 122, 125, 174, 197, 205,

217, 261, 265, 269, 279, 288, 289, 304, 419, 439, 456, 465, 466, 484, 494, 656, 702, 706, 719, 741, 747, 770 *et passim*
Salel, H., 536
Salfi, F., 238
Salio, G., 94, 395
Salis-Sewis, Freiherr von, 331, 408
Salman und Morolf, 751
Salmasius, C., 669
Salomo III, 388
Salons, French, 220
Salt, H. S., 304
Saluts, 392
Saluzzo, D. R., 729
Salvadore, 93
Salvadori, G., 230, 231
Salviati, L., 524, 526, 529
Sampson, J., 304
Samuel, Book of, 629
Sanches, D. A., 262
Sánchez, F., 255
Sánchez, T. A., 734
Sandbach, F. E., 753, 757, 759
Sander, F., 230
Sandys, 277
Sandys, J. E., 86, 184, 668, 679, 702
Sanford, E. C., 124
San Marte, 762
Sannazaro, J., 203, 391, 395, 396, 415, 610, 649
Santayana, G., 304, 494, 719
Santillana, Marquis of, *see* Lopez de Mendoza
Sanvisenti, B., 255, 721
Sappho, 87, 103, 105, 184, 188, 189, 358, 417, 418, 510
Saran, F., 315
Sarasin, P., and F., 374
Sargant, E. B., 291, 295
Sarrazin, G., 304, 739, 740
Sarrazin, J. V., 174, 223
Satire, metrical, 439
Saudé, E., 565
Sauer, A., 322, 327
Saupe, E. J., 589
Savioli, L., 241, 243, 395
Savj-Lopez, P., 231, 234, 255, 258
Savonarola, G., 236, 522
Saxo Grammaticus, 351
Saxo Poeta, 691, 698
Scaliger, J. C., 91, 100, 113, 130, 131, 415, 426, 494, 515, 521, 523, 525, 531, 535, 537, 538, 541, 558, 560, 561, 576, 669, 681
Scandinavian poetry, 339–352, 770–773
Scandone, F., 229
Scarano, N., 234
Scarborough, W., 367
Scarron, P., 469, 712
Scartazzini, G. A., 713, 714, 718
Scévola de St.-Marthe, 398
Schack, A. F. von, 777
Schaefer, 356
Schaff, P., 88, 194
Schaff and Herzog, 365
Schaff and Wace, 517, 690
Schaidenreisser, S., 576
Schanz, M., 174–175, 189, 381, 656, 689
Schaub, E. L., 370, 373
Schede, P. ("Melissus"), 320
Schedel, F. J., 354
Scheder, 175
Scheffel, J. von, 332
Scheffel, J. V., and Holder, A., 701
Scheffer, 352
Scheffler, J. ("Angelus Silesius"), 319
Scheffler, W., 225, 708
Scheler, A., 212
Schelling, F. E., 31, 72–73, 111, 175–176, 265 ff., 275, 279, 415, 421, 561, 614, 744
Schelling, F. W. J. von, 73, 134, 349, 427 *et passim*, 485, 495, 587, 719, 725
Schenkendorf, M. von, 331
Schenker, M., 553
Scherer, E. H. A., 110
Scherer, G., 320
Scherer, W., 134, 138, 141, 176, 309, 312, 587, 589, 667, 752, 754
Scherr, 331
Schettini, Pirro, 239
Schevill, R., 184, 191, 210, 255, 258
Schiller, J. C. F. von, 29, 34, 131–132, 138, 326, 328, 329, 349, 409, 417, 427 *et passim*, 449–450, 471, 474, 475, 479, 495–496, 580, 581, 582–583, 585, 614, 675

Schipper, J., 73, 270, 273, 419, 420
Schläger, G., 315
Schlaf, J., 332
Schlechta-Wssehrd, 777
Schlegel, A. W. von, 134, 180, 301, 331, 343, 409, 417, 456, 460, 479, 496, 581, 675, 725, 764, 765
Schlegel, F. von, 331, 333, 343, 460, 479, 496, 581, 675, 735, 764, 781
Schlegel, J. A., 578
Schliemann, H., 677
Schlotterose, O., 692
Schmedes, G. K. J., 758
Schmeller, J. A., 202, 203, 315
Schmid, L., 762
Schmidt, Erich, 176, 317, 327, 328, 374
Schmidt, J., 304
Schmidt, J. H. H., 21
Schmidt, K. E. K., 409
Schmitt, H., 304
Schmitz, L. Dora, 471, 502
Schnaderhüpfl, 158, 174
Schneckenburger, 331
Schneegans, E., 598, 600, 656
Schneider, A., 258
Schneider, C. E., 17
Schneider, F., 739
Schneider, G., 614
Schneider, L., 337
Schnorf, K., 754
Schnorr von Carolsfeld, 316
Schönaich, 763
Schönbach, A. E., 315, 316, 752, 762
Schofield, W. H., 207, 268, 699, 702, 728, 741
Scholiasts, 137, 511, 513, 667, 678, 681
Scholle, F., 705
Schomberg, 678
Schoolcraft, H. R., 748
Schopenhauer, A., 73–74, 133, 134, 332, 334, 427 *et passim*, 496–497, 587, 603
Schopf, A., 589, 656
Schottel, 577
Schrader, H., 513
Schröder, R., 708
Schröter, A., 129, 203, 320, 322, 393
Schröter, W., 189
Schröttner, W., 184, 191, 210, 255, 393
Schuchhardt, C., 677
Schück, H., 340, 345
Schück and Warburg, 340
Schücking, L. L., 267
Schütz, 363
Schultz, A., 315, 728
Schultz, Oscar, 210, 229
Schulz, Otto, 321
Schulze, K. P., 177, 381
Schulze, W., 443
Schumacher, J., 327
Schuré, É., 177, 310, 656
Schuster, H., 326
Schwab, G., 443
Schwabe, 682
Schwanenflügel, H., 352
Schwartzkopff, W., 589
Schwegler, 686
Schweitzer, 319
Schweitzer, P., 339, 340
Schweringen, G. F. van, 758
Schwicker, J. H., 354
Sciacia, 381
Scientific criticism, *see* Historical-scientific method and movement in criticism; *and* Historical research, principles of
Scoggin and Burkitt, 677
Scolia, 15, 187
Scollard, C., 296
Scott, F. N., *see under* Gayley, C. M., and Scott, F. N.
Scott, J., of Amwell, 118
Scott, J. A., 675
Scott, M. A., 275
Scott, T., 304
Scott, Sir W., 125, 177, 290 ff., 443, 455, 497, 728, 743
Scott, W. B., 294
Scottish poetry, *see* English poetry; Appendix; *also* 280, 306–308
Scripture, 124
Scrocca, A., 246, 725, 747
Scudder, V. D., 744
Scudéry, G. de, 539, 541, 542, 577, 622, 711, 712
Scudéry, Mlle., 541, 712
Searles, G., 722
Seber, 678

Seccombe, T., 289
Seccombe, T., and Saintsbury, G., 289
Séché, L., 536
Seconde rhétorique, 98–100, 535
Secundus, J., 418
Sedgefield, W. J., 736, 738, 739
Sedgwick, D., 306
Sedley, 277, 278
Sedlmayer, 381
Sedulius (Coelius), 193, 385, 690, 694, 695
Sedulius Scotus, 200, 388
Seeck, O., 674
Seeley, J. R., 574
Seelmann, E., 703
Segni, B., 524
Segrais, J. R. de, 466, 543, 558, 567
Segré, C., 234, 275, 421
Seiler, F., 311
Seillière, E., 334
Selbach, L., 210
Selborne, Lord, 191, 306, 335, 366
Seligmann, C. G., 374
Selincourt, B. de, 128, 289
Sélincourt, H. de, 279
Selkirk, J. B., 126
Sellar, W. Y., 74, 177, 191, 381, 413, 433, 438, 497, 614, 682, 683, 684
Sellers, Eugénie, 677
Sem Tob of Carrión, 251
Seneca Rhetor, 87, 515
Seneca the Younger, 87, 515, 724
Sennucio del Bene, 233
Sentimentalism, 344, 376–377, 378, 384, 397, 399, 400, 444, 495, 583, 680, 766 *et passim*
Sepulchral poetry, *see* Young, E.; *also* 395, 397, 408
Sequences, 181, 193, 200, 201, 202
Serafí, P., 261
Serbian poetry, 353–354, 775
Serena, 16, 210
Serveri de Gerona, 253
Servius, 514–515, 687
Sestina, 16, 210
Settegast, F., 705
Settembrini, L., 97, 236, 534
Seuffert, B., 322
Sewall, F., 244, 247
Sextus Empiricus, 510, 513
Seyfriedslied, 754
Seymour, T. D., 598, 656, 677
Shackford, M. H., 447
Shaftesbury, Earl of, 115, 565–566
Shairp, J. C., 74, 126, 145, 289, 304, 497
Shakespeare, W., 271, 272, 273, 274, 275, 325, 403, 414, 461, 502, 581, 634
Sharp, C. J., 270
Sharp, Mrs. E. A., 304, 307
Sharp, W., 21, 74–75, 127, 224, 290, 291, 294, 295, 296, 304, 307
Sheavyn, P., 111
Sheffield, J., *see* Mulgrave, Earl of
Shelley, Lady, 304
Shelley, P. B., 65, 74, 75, 78, 120, 125 ff., 138, 290 ff., 405, 420, 497–498, 687
Shenstone, W., 75, 117, 405, 611
Shepherd, R. H., 304
Sheran, W. H., 128, 574
Sheridan, C. B., 188
Sherman, F. D., 296
Shewan, A., 672
Shorey, P., 184
Short-story and idyl, 450, 451
Shumway, D. B., 755, 757
Sibilet, 99–100, 101
Sichel, W., 289
Sicilian school, 227–230
Sidgwick, F., 498
Sidgwick, H., 304
Sidney, Sir P., 112, 137–138, 271, 272, 274, 276, 403, 404, 426, 444, 556, 610
Sidonius, Apollinaris, 198, 386
Siebert, J., 315
Sievers, 311
Sigerson, G., 307
Sigura, M. G., 732
Sihler, E. G., 128, 575
Sijmons, B., 340
Sikes, E. E., 187
Silius Italicus, 453, 687, 719
Silveira, F. da, 262
Silvestre, G., 257
Simcox, G. A., 574, 743
Sime, J., 758, 760

Simhart, M., 304

Similes, epic, *see* Formulae, epic; *also* 467, 477, 579, 638

Simonds, W. E., 275, 421

Simoni, A., 243

Simonides of Amorgos, 184, 189

Simonides of Ceos, 184, 185, 189, 377, 378, 414, 418, 579

Simrock, K., 320, 737

Singels, N. I., 687

Singer, S. W., 557

Sirvente, 16, 169, 207, 210, 214, 252, 315, 418

Sismondi, J. C. L. S. de, **657**, 712, 727, 735

Sittl, K., 674

Sjöberg, E. ("Vitalis"), 343

Skaldic poems, 767, 768

Skelton, J., 269, 270, 402

Skene, W. F., 308, 309, 744, 749

Skinner, J., 284

Slaughter, W. S., 686

Smart, Christopher, 282, 286, 287

Smart, J. S., 289

Smart, T. B., 304

Smith, A., 304

Smith, Adam, 155–156, **177**

Smith, Alexander, 294

Smith, D. N., 458

Smith, G. G., 111, 555, 557, 558, 560, 608, 629, 741

Smith, Goldwin, 304

Smith, H. P., 365

Smith, James and Horace, 295

Smith, J. H., 205

Smith, K. F., **75**, 375, 380, 381

Smith, M. B., and Jiriczek, 752, 755, 759, 760

Smith, M. E., 624

Smith, M. K., 152

Smithson, G. A., **657**, 698, 740

Smyth, H. W., 177, 183, 187

Smythe, B., 206

Sneath, E. H., 304

Snell, F. J., 230, 234, 420

Snoilsky, C., 344

Soboleski, P., 354, 775

Social conditions and poetry, interrelation, 32, 40–41, 48, 108, 121–122, 139, 144, 164, 172, 184–185, 190, 222, 280, 285, 292, 372, 377–378, 379, 382, 383, 391, 422, 427–428, 437–438, 443, 460, 473, 475, 481, 486, 489, 497, 498, 506, 507, 531, 545, 550, 553, 554, 558, 565, 570, 571, 572, 582, 584, 586, 599, 600–602, 612, 616–617, 619, 626–627, 629, 630, 634, 643, 644, 647, 649, 653, 654, 656, 661, 663, 675–678, 680, 684, 713, 716, 726, 737, 740, 745, 746, 754

Social psychology, 258, 593, 601

Societies, literary, 344, 345, 347, 348, 350, 408, 579

Soerensen, A., **657**, 775

Solberg, T., 339

Solerti, A., 238, 526, 725, 728

Solger, K. W. F., 134, 586, 589

Solomon, Song of, 613

Solon, 184, 377, 380, 508

Sommariva, G., 236

Sommer, H. O., **657**, 744

Sondén, P. A., 340

Song, 13–17, 112, 117–118, 125, 152, 155, 157, 159, 164, 173, 177, 181, 271, 273, 274, 275, 280, 284, 296, 310, 331, 343, 345, 350, 366, 369–374, 421–422, 440, 607–611

Sonnet, 22–25, 100 ff., 112, 117, 134, 157, 158, 163, 165, 169, 179, 180, 216, 218–219, 228, 230, 236, 237, 238–243, 244, 256, 258, 263, 271, 273, 274, 275, 277, 283, 290, 296, 320, 341, 351, 359, 395, 398, 403, 408, 414, 420–421

Sophocles, 186

Sophronius, 192

Sordello, 227, 229

Sorgel, A., 335

Sorrentino, A., 238

Souchay, Abbé, 376

Soumet, 400

Souriau, M., 219, 687

Sousa, R. de, 111, 224

Southey, R., 120, 286, 287, 288, 294, 304, 439, 573, 743

Southwell, R., 278

Souvestre, É., 705

Souze, Mme. de la, 399

Spanish poetry, 156, 248–261, 410, 729–734

Sparling, H. H., 767

Spectator, The, 115, 125, 322, 561, 562, 566
Spedding, J., 304
Spee, F. von, 319
Spegel, Bishop H., 341, 771
Spence, J., 564, 566, 567, 579
Spence, L., 741
Spencer, H., 121, 127, 177, 370, 373
Spencer and Gillen, 607
Spenser, E., 112, 272, 273, 275, 276, 278, 282, 391, 400, 417, 420, 447, 448, 463, 481, 506, 556, 557, 560, 561, 562, 568, 569, 573, 574, 575, 581, 610, 611, 635, 724, 743, **744–745**
"Spensereans," 276, 279, 295
Speratus, 318
Speroni, S., 426, 526
Spiegel, 202
Spiegel, F., 359, 360, 778
Spiegel, P. G. von, 413
Spieghel, H. L., 337, 766
Spielhagen, F., 436, 439, 498, 589, 657
Spielleute, 751
Spiero, H., 309
Spingarn, J. E., 5, 90, 111, 113, 463, 466, 490, 494, 498, 501, 518, 520, 521–522 *et passim*, 528, 557, 560, 561, 562, 563, 572, 727 *et passim*
Spontanus, 537
Sprat, T., 114, 419, 562
Springer, H., 210
Spronck, M., 224
Spurgeon, C. F. E., 304
Squire, C. R., 124
St. Ambrose, 193, 197
St. Augustine, 517, 692
St. Bernard of Clairvaux, 193
St. Francis, 229, 231
St. Gall, school of, 200, 388, 700
St. Hilary of Poitiers, 193, 197
St. John Damascene, 192
St. Mard, R. de, 106
St. Thomas Aquinas, 193
Stadtmueller, H., 188
Staël, Madame de, 96, 107, 109, 553–554, 735
Stägemann, 331
Staffeldt, A. W. S. von, 349, 352
Stagnelius, E. J., 343, 771
Stainer, Sir J., 268
Stallbaum, G., 678
Stampa, Gaspara, 237, 396
Stanley, T., 276, 277
Stanyhurst, R., 556, 687
Staring, A. C. W., 338
Starter, J. J., 338
Statius, 190, 384, 453, 515, 516, 687, 688
Stawell, F. M., 674, 675
Stedman, E. C., 76, 177, 290, 298, 304, 448, **498–499**, 593, 657, 719, 747
Steele, Anne, 283
Steele, Sir R., 116, 280, 281, 285, 287, 288
Steenstrup, J. C. H. R., 608, **657–658**
Steffens, H., 349
Stehlich, F., 289
Stein, H. von, 474
Steiner, B., 189
Steinhausen, G., 321
Steinmar von Klingenau, 314
Steinthal, H., 432 *et passim*, 499, 588, 593, 599 *et passim*, 619, 640, **658–659**, 674
Stemplinger, E., 191, 218
Stengel, E., 98, 196, 275
Stengel, F., 210
Stennett, 283
Stenzler, A. F., 782
Stephanus (French, *Estienne*), H., 446
Stephen, J. K., 295
Stephen, Sir L., 115, 179, 289
Stephens, James, 291, 295
Stephens, Thos., 306, 308
Stern, Adolf, 330
Stern, Alfred, 747
Stern, L. C., 306
Sterry, 295
Stesichorus, 184, 188, 417
Steuerwald, W., 76
Stev, 158
Stevens, W. O., 268
Stevenson, R. L., 291, 295, 296
Sthen, H., 346
Stiàvelli, G., 722
Stigelius, Johannes, 203
Stigliani, T., 93, 240

Stilgebauer, E., 315
Stimming, A., 208, 209, 659
Stjernhjelm, G., 341, 344, 771
Stoics, criticism of poetry, 509–510, 517, 518, 520
Stokes, W., and Strachan, J., 307
Stolberg, F. L. von, 325, 327
Stone, C., 290
Storm, E., 346, 348, 772
Storm, T., 330, 332, 409
Stornello, 16, 395
Storr, F., 701
Story, A. T., 289
Stout, G. F., 36
Strabo, Walafridus, 194, 200, 691, 697, 698, 699
Strachan, J., 307, 309
Strachan and O'Keefe, 749
Strachey, Sir E., 728, 744
Strambotto, 16, 158, 226, 395
Strandberg, K. V. A., 344
Straub, L., 187
Streicher, O., 315
Strindberg, J. A., 344
Strobl, J., 758
Strocchi, 244
Strodtmann, A., 327, 334
Stronski, S., 210
Stroza, 415
Stuart, A. B. C., 783
Stuart-Glennie, J. S., 188
Stub, A., 347
Stúñiga, Cancionero de, 251, 254
Suardi, G. F., 236
Subjectivity, epic, 499
Subjectivity, lyric, 4, 5–6, 8–10, 20, 27, 45–46, 47, 48, 52, 57, 61, 72, 73, 76, 80, 113, 120, 122, 126, 133, 152, 172, 184, 214, 217, 221, 267, 271, 292, 357, 366, 373, 380, 382, 391, 418, 431, 502 *et passim*
Suchenwirt, P., 317
Suchier, H., 213
Suchier, H., and Birch-Hirschfeld, A., 204
Suckling, 276, 278
Suddard, S. J. M., 305
Sudre, L., 623, 624, 637, 711
Suidas, 669
Sully-Prudhomme, 46, 111, 222, 400
Sulpicia, 384
Sulzer, J. G., 76–77, 499–500, 580, 585
Sumerian poetry, 363, 782–783
Summers, 688
Summo, F., 527
Supernatural in the epic, *see* Marvellous; *also* Myth in epic
Suphan, B., 476, 633
Surrey, Earl of, 271, 272, 273, 275, 403, 555, 687
Susemihl, F., 178, 413, 511, 681
Suttermeister, O., 77, 500
Suttina, L., 233
Svedberg, J., 341
Swanwick, A., 305
Swedish poetry, 340–345, 770–772
Swift, J., 282, 287, 417, 419, 426, 427, 492, 565, 772
Swinburne, A. C., 21, 63, 77, 126, 223, 289, 290 ff., 405, 406, 418, 420, 743
Swiss School of criticism, 130–131, 578–579
Sylvester, J., 711
Symbolists, 46, 108, 111, 222, 224, 264, 332, 409
Symonds, J. A., 77–78, 127, 178, 189, 201, 202, 231, 248, 275, 294, 305, 393, 395, 396, 413, 431 *et passim*, 451, 498, 500, 593, 614, 659–660, 712, 714, 728, 747
Symons, A., 128, 224, 279, 289, 291, 305
Symons, B., 752
Symposia, 376; *see* Convivial lyric
Synesius, 192
Syriac poetry, 355

Tacitus, 749
Tagelied, 315
Taillandier, R. G. E., 110
Taillemont, C., 398
Taine, H. A., 29, 108, 110, 123, 141
Talavera, S., 252
Tale, metrical, 439, 472, 483, 783; *see also* Romances
Talvj, 178, 774
Tamizey de Lorroque, 542
Tannahill, 284
Tannenberg, B. de, 260
Tannhäuser, Der, 314, 315

Tansillo, L., 237, 238, 396
Tarbé, P., 212
Tarde, G., 108, 145, 258, 601
Tascherau, 220
Tasso, B., 237, 419, 651, 724
Tasso, T., 92, 237, 238, 426, 435 *et passim*, 458, 466, 470, 473, 492, 500, 501–502, 507, 522, 524, 526, 528, 529, 531, 533, 534, 541, 544, 550, 559, 561, 562, 568, 569, 571, 573, 578, 579, 588, 599, 601, 610, 686, 690, 720, 722, 723, 724, **725–728** (editions and translations, 726–727), 745, 746, 747, 766
Tassoni, A., 92, 500, **529**, 543, 728–729
Tate, N., 405
Tatian, 519
Taubert, O., 320
Taylor, Bayard, 296, 420
Taylor, E., 312
Taylor, H. O., 78, 88, 184, 192, 196, 689, 702
Taylor, J., 364
Taylor, T., 513
Taylor, Tom, 309
Taylorian Lectures, 240
Tedeschi, A., 289
Tegnér, E., 343–344, 345, 771
Telleen, J. M., 551
Temple, Sir W., 114, 492, 562
Ten Brink, B., 178, 338, 401, 593, 628, 660, 738
Tendencies of the lyric, 146–147
Tenneroni, A., 231
Tennyson, A., 34, 68, 120, 125 ff., 290 ff., 405, 420, 429, 447, 448, 450, 452, 742, 743, 748
Tennyson, H., 305
Tenson, 16, 207, 210
Terkelsen, 346
Terpander, 188
Terrason, Abbé J., 492, **547–548**, 551
Terret, V., 593, 595, 660, 674
Terry, C. S., 289
Tertullian, 517, 692
Testa d'Arezzo, Arrigo, 228, 229
Testi, F., 239, 396
Tettau, W. J. A., Freiherr von, 774
Teuffel, W. S., 178, 191, 381, 660, 689
Teutonic heroic poetry, stages of, 595, 667
Texte, J., 108, 111, 224, 289, 305
Thackeray, W. M., 289, 295
Thám, W., 354
Thayer, M. R., 184, 191
Theagenes of Rhegium, 511, 521
Theocritus, 186, 378, 379, 391, 443, 445 *et passim*, 452, 462, 464, 483, 609, 610, 611–614, 626, 649, 680
Theodor, H., 708
Theodulf, 199, 385, 388, 696
Theognis, 184, 377, 380, 508
Théophile de Viau, 399
Theophilus of Antioch, 519
Theophrastus, 514
Thidrekssaga, 754, 758
Thiele, J. M., 345
Thiell, C. P., 782
Thieme, H. P., 205
Thiersch, F., 189
Thimme, A., 135, 225
Thom, W., 284, 295
Thomander, 345
Thomas, A., 208, 229
Thomas, Calvin, 309, 313, 317, 329
Thomas, L. P., 258
Thomas, W., 289
Thompson, A. H., 279
Thompson, E. N. S., 562, 574, 747
Thompson, F., 78, 128, 291, 295, 302, 305
Thompson, G. A., 111
Thompson, Hamilton, 289
Thompson, J. ("B. V."), 127, 294, 295
Thompson, V., 224
Thomson, J., 281, 282, 285, 286, 287, 288, 289, 322, 347, 397, 399, 611
Thomson, J. A. K., 674, 677
Thorild, T., 343, 345
Thornbury, 296
Threnody, 267, 372, 375, 376, 377, 379–380, 383, 384, 386, 387, 388, 389, 390, 391, 393–394, 395, 396, 397, 398, 399, 400, 401 ff., 406, 407, 410, 411–412, 481
Threnos, 15, 187
Thurau, G., 78, 178
Tibaud de Champagne, 211, 212

Tibullus, 75, 101, 103, 105, 163, 190, 381, 382–384, 394, 400, 405
Tickell, 405
Ticknor, 248, 257
Tieck, L., 331, 333, 343
Tiedge, 331, 408
Tiersot, J., 179, 213, 220, 225
Tigri, 248
Tille, A., 329, 330, 332
Tilley, 216, 217, 537, 711
Timayenis, T. T., 677
Timotheus, 186
Tincani, C., 722
Tinker, C. B., 738, 740
Tiraboschi, G., 95, 528, 530, 533, 702
Tissot, E., 223
Tissot, P. F., 400, 686
Tittmann, J., 317, 321, 327, 336
Tobit, Book of, 447, 613
Toda, E., 261
Todd, J. H., 307
Tollens, H., 338, 766
Tollkiehn, J., 686
Tolman, A. H., 739
Tolomei, C., 91
Tomas, Bishop, 340, 770
Tombo, R., 327, 764
Tomlinson, C., 78, 234, 305
Tommasèo, 97, 245, 248, 534
Tommasso de Celano, 193
Tompa, M., 354
Tomson, G. R., 188
Topelius, Z., 344
Toplady, 283
Torraca, F., 97, 227, 229, 247
Torrellas, Pero, 252
Torti, G., 95–96, 244
Tory, G., 99
Toscanella, 523
Tottell, 271
Tourreil, J. de, 492
Tovey, D. C., 289
Toynbee, P., 713, 719
Tozer, H. F., 719
Trail, H. D., 305
Transubstantiation, literary influence of doctrine of, 622
Trapp, J., 116, 564, 566, 567
Traube, L., 199, 200
Trautmann, M., 739, 740
Trechmann, E. J., 778
Trelawny, E. J., 305
Trench, R. C., 25, 89, 194
Treneuil, J., 400
Trent, W. P., 305, 378, 747
Trevelyan, R. C., 291
Trezza, G., 247
Triolet, 16, 110, 129
Triplett, N., 124
Trissino, G. G., 91, 426, 524–525, 531, 601, 725, 727
Troll, P., 381
Troubadours, 98, 164, 170, 191, 205–211, 214, 221, 227–229, 231, 250–255, 262, 265, 269, 392–393, 395, 402, 410, 716, 728
Trouvères, 142, 143, 153, 207, 211–213, 214, 231, 265, 269, 703–711, 728
Trublet, Abbé, 551
Trucchi, F., 226
Truffi, R., 721
Tryphiodorus, 682
Tscherning, A., 408, 417, 419
Tschersig, H., 179, 333
Tsountas and Manatt, 677
Tubino, F. M., 261
Tucker, F. G., 184
Tucker, S. M., 416
Tullin, C. B., 346, 347, 351
Turberville, 271
Turk, M., 754
Turkish poetry, 354–355, 783
Turrin, C., 398
Twining, T., 454, 467
Twyne, T., 555
Tyler, W. S., 677
Tylor, E. B., 371, 373, 593
Tynan, Katherine, 291
Types, literary: their growth, 140–141, 144–146, 147, 151, 152, 153, 185, 216, 252, 263, 267, 271, 284, 372, 377, 379, 383, 386, 387, 388, 389, 390, 393, 414, 416, 421–422, 429, 481, 545, 588, 599, 601, 609, 610, 611–613, 618, 629–630, 631, 640, 642, 645, 646, 647–648, 649–650, 680–681, 690, 693, 703, 706–707, 714–716, 721–722, 726, 737, 741, 745, 746, 767–768, 776, 778–779

Tyroller, F., 624
Tyrrell, R. Y., 574, 683, 687
Tyrtaeus, 184, 188, 377
Tyrwhitt, 283
Tzetzes, J., 521

Uc Brunet, 250
Uc de Mataplana, 253
Uc de San Circ, 250
Uhl, W., 311
Uhland, L., 310, 316, 319, 331, 333, 336, 708, 752, 760
Ulrich von Lichtenstein, 314
Ulrici, H., 78–79, 431 *et passim*, 502–503, 586, 675
Unflad, L., 329
Unger, J. H. W., 338
Ungnad and Gressmann, 783
Unities of time and place, 454, 458, 493, 524, 537
Unity of the epic, idyl, etc., 424, 426, 433, 435, 451, 454, 471, 473, 484, 485, 489, 501, 505, 522, 525, 526, 533, 539, 541, 545, 546, 551, 568, 573, 580, 589, 602, 621, 626, 628, 640, 655, 659, 664, 666, 725, 731
Unity of the lyric, 10, 12
Upham, A. H., 219, 275, 421, 537
Urban, E., 179, 329, 415
Urbanus, 200
Usener, H., 375, 376, 597, 660
Ussani, V., 686
Utilitarianism, 121, 292, 332
Uz, J. P., 323, 409

Vaganay, H., 179, 238, 420
Valdés, M., 260
Valente, M., 247
Valentin, V., 135
Valera, J., 260
Valeriani, L., 226
Valerius Aedituus, 382
Valerius Flaccus, 687, 688, 719
Valgius Rufus, 384
Valla, L., 523, 720
Vallance, A., 305
Vallmanya, A., 253
Valmiki, 779, 781
Vanderburgh, F. A., 363
Vannetti, C., 95
Vannoz, 400
Vanozzo, F., 234
Vanzolini, G., 189, 376
Varano, A., 241, 729
Varchi, B., 527
Varro Atacinus, 382
Varro, Terentius, 513–514
Vasconcellos, M. de, 249, 258, 261, 265, 420, 732, 735
Vaticana, Cancioneiro da, 262, 264, 265
Vaudeville, 16, 118, 214
Vaughan, C. E., 111, 305, 333
Vaughan, H., 276, 277
Vaughan, W., 560
Vauquelin de la Fresnaye, 102, 426, 433, 535, 537
Vauvenargues, 105
Vaux, Lord, 272
Vedel, A. S., 346, 351
Vega, Garcilaso de la, *see* Garcilaso
Vega y Arguëlles, A. L. de la, 258
Veitch, J., 127, 145, 179, 743
Venantius Fortunatus, *see* Fortunatus
Venturi, G. A., 239
Veránek, 130
Verdizzotti, 728
Vere, Aubrey de, 127
Verhaeren, É., 224
Verlaine, P., 401
Véron, E., 599, 661
Verri, A., 397
Verrier, M., 79
Vers de société, 32–33, 63, 114, 126, 127, 168, 275, 277, 281–282, 295, 349, 379, 406
Versification, medieval vs. modern French, 215
Versification, modern, rise of, 192, 193, 195–197, 386, 387, 388, 389, 692, 697, 699
Vettori, P., 524
Veyrières, L. de, 179, 420
Vial, F., and Denise, L., 102, 104, 546
Vianey, J., 218, 219, 420
Vicente, Gil, 263
Vico, G. B., 492, 530, 531–532, 533, 534, 553, 584, 594, 617, 661–662, 667, 670, 674

Victor, C. M., 690, 694
Victorinus, 690, 693
Victorius (*for* P. Vettori ?), 523
Vida, M. H., 100, 138, 426, 433, 463, 494, 503, 521, 522–523, 528, 536, 537, 541, 552, 576, 603, 690, 725
Vidal, Peire, 208, 250
Vidal de Besalú, R., 98, 253
Viehoff, H., 79, 134, 329, 503
Viélé-Griffin, F., 224
Vierkandt, A., 373, 593
Vigfusson, G., 339, 770
Vigfusson and Powell, 340, 662, 758, 768, 769, 770
Vigié-Lecocq, E., 224
Vignati, C., 243
Vigny, A. de, 46, 221, 223, 400
Vigo, 248
Villanelle, 16, 214
Villani, N., 529
Villari, 97
Villarosa, March. di, 226
Villasandino, 252
Ville de Mirmont, H. de la, 681, 686
Villemain, M., 79, 108, 109, 189
Villemarqué, Vicomte de la, 306, 308, 309, 711
Villey, P., 100
Villoison, 667, 670, 678
Villon, F., 101, 214, 221
Vilmar, A. F. C., 317, 320, 328, 329
Vincent, C., 79, 503
Vinet, A. R., 109
Vinje, A. O., 351, 773
Viperanus, I. A., 91
Virelay, 101, 207, 214
Virgil, 196, 216, 255, 257, 384, 385, 387, 391, 424, 425, 429, 433, 438, 446, 449, 454, 458, 468, 469, 470, 471, 472, 473, 476, 480, 481, 486, 487, 488, 490, 491, 492, 493, 494, 495, 497, 503, 504, 505, 513, 514, 515, 516, 517, 518, 521, 522–523, 524, 526, 528, 529, 530, 531, 532, 534, 536, 539, 541, 543, 544, 549, 550, 551, 552, 553, 555, 556, 557, 558, 560, 561, 562, 563, 565, 566, 567, 571, 574, 576, 578, 579, 581, 593, 596, 599, 601, 610, 612, 613, 614, 622, 638, 642, 643, 644, 649, 657, 660, 667, 680, 681, 683–687, 690, 691, 692, 693, 694, 696, 700, 709, 712, 714, 716, 724, 746, 750, 751, 764, 766
Visan, T. de, 224
Vischer, F. T., 80, 134, 138, 139, 145, 332, 412, 427, 503, 587
Visconti, E., 247
Vision, poetry of mystic, 241, 622, 691, 699, 716, 718
Vismara, A., 246
Visscher, Anna, 766
Visscher, R. P., 337, 766
Visscher, Tesselschade, 766
Vittorelli, J., 241, 243, 395
Vittorino da Feltre, 523
Vivaldi, V., 728
Vivian, S. P., 279
Vogl, 353
Vogt, F., 312, 752, 758, 760
Vogt and Koch, 763
Voigt, E., 624, 637
Voigt, G., 234, 662, 702, 713
Voiture, 103
Volkmann, R., 513, 675
Volkslied, 15
Vollhardt, 270
Vollmöller, 756
Volpi, G., 232, 234, 721
Volsunga Saga, 491, 754, 767, 769
Volta, A., 705, 725
Voltaire, F. M. A. de, 105–106, 131, 243, 399, 416, 426, 433, 457, 458, 484, 504–505, 533, 537, 545–546, 551, 552, 553, 570, 571, 578, 587, 601, 686, 712, 724, 734, 766
Vondel, J. van den, 338, 746, 748, 766
Voretzsch, C., 598, 623, 624, 662, 708, 758
Voss, J. H., 325, 408, 687, 764
Voss *or* Vossius, G. J., 129, 523, 541, 576, 589
Vossler, K., 90, 179, 231, 273, 321, 719
Vukadinović, S., 289

Wace, 742
Wackernagel, F. E., 310
Wackernagel, P., 336
Wackernagel, W., 80–81, 134, 138, 212, 327, 375, 406, 409, 418, 419, 436 *et passim*, 448, 451, 505, 587, 597, 599 *et passim*, 637, 662–663

Wackernagel, W., and Rieger, M., 314
Waddell, H., 367
Waddington, S., 25, 230, 290, 305, 420
Wagenseil, 316
Wagner, R., 753, 762
Wahlund, C., 206
Waitz and Gerland, 373
Walafrid Strabo, *see* Strabo
Walch, G., 107, 222
Waldberg, M., Freiherr von, 317, 421
Waldere, 701, 736, 750
Waldis, B., 318, 320
Waldmüller, R., 332
Waliszewski, K., 353, 774, 775
Walker, E., 275
Walker, Hugh, 289, 290, 292, 305
Walkley, A. B., 128
Wallaschek, R., 180, 374
Wallensköld, A., 316
Waller, E., 276, 277, 278, 417
Wallis, J. P. R., 289
Walpole, 283
Walsh, Clara A., 368
Walsh, W., 405
Walter, E. T., 316
Waltharius, 690, 700–701, 736, 750
Walther von der Vogelweide, 314, 315, 316, 407, 418, 665
Walther von Speier, 701
Walz, 513
Walzel, O. F., 460, 583
Waniek, G., 326
War songs, 15, 151, 169, 177, 220, 224, 266, 267, 290, 291, 323, 335, 372, 375, 376, 377, 378, 415, 422, 440; *see also* Patriotic poetry
Warburg, 340
Warburton, W., 564, 567
Ward, A. W., 279
Ward, H. L. D., 711, 741
Ward, T. H., 266, 290, 305
Warner, A. G. and E., 776
Warr, G. C. W., 178
Warren, F. M., 180, 195, 203, 624
Warren, T. H., 305
Warren, W. F., 677
Warton, J., 115, 116, 117, 282, 283, 286, 289, 564, 566, 567–568, 581, 611
Warton, T., 115, 118, 283, 286, 569, 611, 664, 743, 744
Wasson, D. A., 431 *et passim*, 505
Waterhouse, G., 162, 321
Waterman, T. T., 592, 664
Watson, J., 275, 280, 284
Watson, T., 272
Watson, Sir William, 291, 294, 295, 296, 297, 305, 405, 416
Watts, H. E., 732
Watts, I., 116, 283
Watts-Dunton, W. T., 19, 22, 23, 81–82, 127, 128, 289, 305, 431 *et passim*, 505, 602, 664
Waugh, A., 305
Way, A. S., 678, 681
Webbe, W., 112, 426, 556–557
Weber, A., 361
Weber, E., 589
Weber, H. W., 758
Weber, O., 363, 782, 783
Webster, Augusta, 291, 295
Wechssler, E., 316, 762
Weckerlin, J. B., 219, 225
Weckherlin, G. R., 318, 320–321, 407, 417, 419, 577
Weddingen, O., 316, 335
Wedewer, H., 589, 686
Weever, 416
Wegener, C. F., 351
Weidinger, 611
Weinberg, 611
Weinhold, K., 316, 752
Weise, 330
Weise, C., 577
Weiss, A., 36
Weissenborn, E., 677
Weitbrecht, 328
Welcker, F. G., 549, 650, 664, 675, 679
Welhaven, J. S. C., 351, 352
Wellauer, 681
Weller, E., 319
Weller, P., 711
Wellhausen, 365
Wells, B. W., 758
Wells, C., 33
Wells, J. E., 268
Welsh poetry, *see* Appendix; *also* 306–309
Welstead, L., 116
Welti, H., 134, 180
Welwood, J., 566
Wendell, B., 82, 614
Wenig, J. G., 356

Werenfels, 577
Wergeland, H., 351, 352, 773
Wernaer, R. M., 180, 664
Werner, K., 697
Werner, R. M., 82, 135, 137, 148–149, 180, 587
Wernicke, C., 67, 415, 417, 577
Wernicke, F. A. E., 682
Wernsdorf, J. C., 381
Weselmann, C. A. F., 563
Wesley, John and Charles, 283
Wessel, J. H., 347, 348, 351
Wessely, E., 353
West, E. W., 360
West, G., 117
Westermarck, 371
Weston, J. L., 268, 743, 758, 762
Wetstein, J. R., 669
Weygandt, C., 128, 291, 305
Wharton, H. T., 189
Wheeler, A. L., 380, 381
Wheeler, S., 305
Whibley, C., 279
Whibley, L., 189, 638, 668
Whitcomb, S. L., 574
White, F. D., 504
White, G., 82–83, 305
White, J. B., 296
Whiting, Lillian, 305
Whitman, C. H., 740
Whitman, Walt, 296
Whitmore, C. E., 234
Whitney, W. D., 362
Wicksteed, P. H., 719
Widmann, W., 760
Wiedemann, A., 364
Wieland, C. M., 325, 328, 348, 349, 399, 409, 675, 764
Wielandlied, 749
Wiener, L., 352, 775
Wieselgren, P., 340, 345
Wiffen, 256, 258
Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, U. von, 183, 191, 194, 380, 381, 382, 414, 477, 593, 595, 664–665, 675, 679, 686
Wilde, O., 291, 294, 297, 301
Wiles, J., 775
Wilkie, W., 439, 567, 568
Wilkinson, W. C., 433, 435, 603, 748
Will, relation of, to action in epic, 502, 506, 573, 586, 755
Willems, 624
Williams Ab Ithel, J., 308
Williams, Taliesin, 308
Williams, T. C., 687
Wilmanns, W., 314, 316, 665, 756, 758, 759, 760
Wilmar, A. F. C., 310
Wilmotte, M., 213, 224, 227
Wilson, C. T., 353
Wilson, D., 289
Wilson, H. H., 362, 781
Wilson, J., 120, 305
Winchelsea, Lady, 282, 287, 288, 611
Winchester, C. T., 83
Winckels, F. G. de, 246
Winckler, H., 782
Windscheid, K., 181, 275, 665
Winkel, J. te, 337, 338
Winkworth, 335
Winstanley, L., 305
Winternitz, M., 780
Winther, C., 350
Wirsén, C. D. af, 344
Wirsung, C., 320
Wirth, A., 505
Wise, T. J., 305
Wiseman, Card., 492
Wither, 276, 278, 282
Witkop, P., 136, 309, 322
Witkowski, G., 321, 326, 329
Witte, C., 719
W. J., 666
Wodehouse, Mrs. E. (A. H.), 17, 181
Wörner, 686
Wogue, 220
Wolf, F. A., i.e. Christ. Wilh. Aug., 430, 479, 549, 553, 565, 570, 584–585, 594, 616, 617, 621, 623, 627–628, 635, 641, 649, 650, 655, 661–662, 665, 666–667, 668, 669, 670–671, 672, 673, 674, 675, 678, 684, 685, 756
Wolf, F. J., 181, 201, 249, 250, 256, 264, 729, 735
Wolf, L., 758
Wolff, E., 6, 83, 132, 134, 141, 145, 181, 330, 437, 506, 587, 667, 758
Wolff, O., 310
Wolfian, or composite, theory of epic development, 482
Wolfram von Eschenbach, 313, 751, 761, 762

Wollner, W., 775
Woman-worship, *see* Feminization of poetry, *Dolce stil nuovo*, Troubadours, Trouvères, *Minnesang*, *Meistergesang*, Erotic lyric, Pastoral, etc.
Women in epic, 541, 680, 752, 762
Women of Homer, 457–458, 500
Wood, E., 306
Wood, R., 533, 553, 565, 569, 584, 617, 634, **667**, 670, 674, **677–678**
Woodberry, G. E., 84, 128, 306, 420, 433 *et passim*, **506**, 659, 728, 735
Woolner, T., 294
Wordsworth, C., 306
Wordsworth, J., 190
Wordsworth, W., 7, 33, 34, 50, 65, 84, 119–120, 125 ff., 138, 144, 224, 284, 290 ff., 420, 452, 456, 743
Work-songs, 142, 152, 155, 177, 422
Worsley and Connington, 678
Wotke, K., 203
Wotton, Sir H., 34, 278
Wotton, W., 492, **562–563**, 564
Wrangham, D. S., 202
Wright, C. H. C., 205
Wright, T., 202, 268, 413, 702
Wright, T., and Halliwell, J. O., 89
Wright, W., 355
Writing in relation to epic development, 428, 443, 540, 582, 599, 600, 625, 648, 665, 666, 668
Wülker, R. P., 267, **268**, 588, 604, 736, 738, 740, 747
Wundt, W., 9, 36, 370, 371, 373, 593, 597
Wurzbach, W. von, 327
Wyatt, 271, 272, 274, 275, 403
Wychgram, J., 329
Wylie, L. J., 111, 563
Wyndham, G., 218
Wyss, 310

Xeno, 669
Xenophanes, 378, 475, 508, 516
Ximenez, Father, 783

Yalden, T., 419
Yañez, R., 733
Yeats, W. B., 291, 295, 306, 307
Yorke, O. (Mahoney, F. S.), 452–453
Young, C. C., 625
Young, E., 22, **84–85**, 116, 282, 287, 288, 289, 323, 324, 397, 399, 405, 417, 564, 566, 568
Ysengrimus, 623, 624

Zachariae, F. W., 409
Zacher, 375
Zamora, Chanson du siège de, 733
Zanella, G., 243, 244, 245, 246, 247
Zanghieri, T., 189
Zani, C., 528
Zanotti, F. M., 95
Zapletal, O. P., 366
Zappi, 241
Zarncke, F., 753, 756
Zedlitz, J. C. F. von, 409
Zell, K., 754
Zenatti, A., 229
Zenker, R., 208, 210, 762
Zeno, A., 242
Zenodotus, 511
Zesen, 577
Zhukóvskiy, V., 353, 774
Ziller, F., 705
Zimmer, 743
Zimmermann, F., 85, 432, 460, **506–507**
Zimmermann, R., 134, 589
Zimmermann, Z., 681
Zimmern, Heinrich, 363
Zimmern, Helen, 776
Zincke, P., 334
Zingarelli, N., 229, 702, 705, 719
Zingerle, A. R., 182, 234, 381
Zocco, I., 234, 275, 421
Zöckler, O., 689
Zoïlus, 511
Zorilla, 260
Zorzi, Bartol., 227
Zottoli, 367
Zschalig, H., 98
Zuccolo, 93
Zumbini, B., 97, 234, 246, 247, 395, 534, 722, 725
Zutavern, K., 705
Zwingli, H. (U.), 576
Zyromski, E., 223

ANNOUNCEMENTS

BOOKS IN
ENGLISH LITERATURE

Alexander: Introduction to the Poetry of Robert Browning
Aristotle on the Art of Poetry (Cooper)
Boynton: A History of American Literature
Bright and Miller: Elements of English Versification
Buck: Social Forces in Modern Literature
Cooper: Methods and Aims in the Study of Literature
Corson: Primer of English Verse
Gayley: Classic Myths in English Literature (Revised Edition)
Gayley and Kurtz: Methods and Materials of Literary Criticism: Lyric, Epic, and Allied Forms of Poetry
Gayley and Scott: Introduction to the Methods and Materials of Literary Criticism
Genung: Guidebook to the Biblical Literature
Gummere: Handbook of Poetics
Hudson: Life, Art, and Characters of Shakespeare. 2 vols. Cloth; half morocco
Lewis: Beginnings of English Literature
Long: American Literature
Long: English Literature
Long: Outlines of English and American Literature
    Also in two volumes: Outlines of English Literature
                         Outlines of American Literature
Minto: Manual of English Prose Literature
Painter: Elementary Guide to Literary Criticism
Phelps: Beginnings of the English Romantic Movement
Saintsbury: Loci Critici. Passages Illustrative of Critical Theory
Sherman: Analytics of Literature
Smith: Synopsis of English and American Literature
Smith: The American Short Story
Sneath: Wordsworth — Poet of Nature and Poet of Man
Trent, Hanson, and Brewster: Introduction to the English Classics (Revised Edition)
Wild: Geographic Influences in Old Testament Masterpieces
Winchester: Five Short Courses of Reading in English Literature

31

GINN AND COMPANY PUBLISHERS

BOOKS ON THE STUDY OF POETRY

METHODS AND MATERIALS OF LITERARY CRITICISM:

LYRIC, EPIC, AND ALLIED FORMS OF POETRY

By CHARLES MILLS GAYLEY, University of California, and BENJAMIN O. KURTZ, University of California.

A CRITICAL study of the Song, Hymn, Ode, Sonnet, Epigram, Elegy, Idyl, Ballad, Pastoral, and Heroic Romance in all times and among all nations. For purposes of detailed investigation the book offers every advantage.

ENGLISH POETRY (1170–1892)

By JOHN MATTHEWS MANLY, The University of Chicago. 8vo, cloth, xxviii + 580 pages

A WELL-SELECTED anthology of convenient size. The introduction furnishes interesting and necessary information concerning authors and poems.

THE ELEMENTS OF ENGLISH VERSIFICATION

By JAMES WILSON BRIGHT, Johns Hopkins University, and RAYMOND D. MILLER, University of Missouri. 12mo, cloth, xii + 166 pages

THE metrical form of poetry is comprehensively treated in this volume. Part One is concerned with the individual verse; Part Two deals with the grouping of verses. Fresh and varied examples from the great poets illustrate the subject.

ARISTOTLE ON THE ART OF POETRY

Translated and adapted by LANE COOPER, Cornell University. 12mo, cloth, xxix + 101 pages

AN AMPLIFIED version of the "Poetics" of Aristotle, which, by means of a running marginal gloss, interpolated comments, and the expansion and clarifying of Aristotle's examples, aims to make this famous treatise thoroughly intelligible to all students of English.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA LIBRARY, LOS ANGELES
COLLEGE LIBRARY
This book is due on the last date stamped below.

REC'D COL. LIB.
Dec 16'70
DEC 10 1970
REC'D COL. LIB.
College Library MAY 10'71
MAY 11 1971
REC'D COL. LIB.
College Library MAY 19'71
MAY 20 1971
REC'D COL. LIB.
College Library JUL 21 '71
JUL 14 1971
College Library REC'D COL. LIB.
NOV 22 '71
NOV 21 1971
College Library REC'D COL. LIB.
JAN 5 1976
DEC 30 1975

26 MAY '79 14 DAY
05 JUN '79 REC CL
JUN 10 '81 14 DAY
JUN 8 81 REC CL

Book Slip—Series 428

NOV 15 1967

THE LIBRARY
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA
LOS ANGELES

College
Library

PN
1105
G25

UCLA-College Library
PN 1105 G25
L 005 693 261 9

UC SOUTHERN REGIONAL LIBRARY FACILITY
A 001 105 231 3

Festin burlesque [illegible]